

17
The Speech Teacher

A PUBLICATION OF THE
SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

21 1957
PERIODICALS
READING ROOM

Volume VI

Number 1

- | | |
|---|--|
| The Ethics of Debating Both Sides | <i>Richard Murphy</i> |
| On Defining Communication | <i>Thomas R. Nilsen</i> |
| A "Discography" of Commercially
Recorded Speeches | <i>Gordon L. Thomas and
David Potter</i> |
| Teaching Speech in a Liberal Arts
Program for Young Executives | <i>Victor M. Powell</i> |
| Televised Forensics | <i>Wayne E. Brockriede and David B. Strother</i> |
| Meeting Speech Needs in the Public Schools:
The Speech Program in a Teachers College | <i>Ellen Kauffman</i> |
| Oral Communication in
Elementary School Living | <i>Mardel Ogilvie</i> |
| Co-operation between High School and College in the
Teaching of Oral Interpretation | <i>Ralph N. Schmidt</i> |
| What Can Courses in Radio and Television
Writing Accomplish? | <i>Edgar E. Willis</i> |
| A Listening Course for High School Seniors | <i>Ralph Renwick, Jr.</i> |
| The Power of an Air Wave | <i>Wildon Stirtz</i> |
| Tournaments: For Better or Worse? | <i>Grace Walsh</i> |

THE FORUM • BOOK REVIEWS • IN THE PERIODICALS
AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS • THE BULLETIN BOARD

January 1957

The SPEECH TEACHER

• 1957 •

Published by
THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

EDITOR
HENRY L. MUELLER
University of Illinois

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT
SHIRLEY CARMACK
University of Illinois

ADVISORY EDITORS

Bower Aly, *University of Missouri*; J. Jeffery Auer, *University of Virginia*; Dallas C. Dickey, *University of Florida*; Wilbur S. Howell, *Princeton University*; Franklin H. Knowler, *The Ohio State University*.

CONSULTING EDITORS

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Jean C. Ervin, *Arlington County [Virginia] Public Schools*; Geraldine Garrison, *Connecticut State Department of Education*; Elise Hahn, *University of California at Los Angeles*; Zelda Horner Kosh, *Arlington, Virginia*; Mardel Ogilvie, *Queens College*; John J. Pruis, *Western Michigan College*; C. Agnes Rigney, *State Teachers College, Geneseo, New York*.

SECONDARY SCHOOL

Charles L. Balcer, *State Teachers College, Oswego, New York*; Hayden K. Carruth, *University of Michigan*; Mary Blackburn, *Granite City [Illinois] High School*; Lawrence S. Jenness, *Arlington Heights [Illinois] High School*; Freda Kenner, *Messick High School, Memphis, Tennessee*; Evelyn Konigsberg, *New York City Public Schools*; Yetta G. Mitchell, *New York University*; Oliver W. Nelson, *University of Washington*; Bea Olmstead, *Hamtramck [Michigan] Public Schools*; Waldo Phelps, *University of California at Los Angeles*; Oretta Jane Whitworth, *Amarillo [Texas] High School*.

UNDERGRADUATE STUDY

Mildred F. Betty, *Rockford College*; Roberta M. Buchanan, *St. Petersburg [Florida] Junior College*; Arthur Eisenstadt, *Newark [New Jersey] Board of Education*; H. L. Ewbank, Jr., *Purdue University*; Donald E. Hargis, *University of California at Los Angeles*; Alan Huckleberry, *Ball State Teachers College*; Wilbur E. Moore, *Central Michigan College of Education*; William H. Perkins, *University of Southern California*; A. L. Thurman, Jr., *Michigan State University*.

GRADUATE STUDY

Clyde W. Dow, *Michigan State University*; Magdalene Kramer, *Teachers College, Columbia University*; Horace G. Rahskopf, *University of Washington*.

TEACHING SPEECH TO PREACHERS

Fred J. Barton, *Abilene [Texas] Christian College*; Lowell G. McCoy, *Hebrew Union College*; Charles A. McGlon, *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary*; Charles E. Weniger, *Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary*.

TEACHING SPEECH IN THE ARMED SERVICES

George F. Batka, *University of Maryland*; C. David Cornell, *Convair-Pomona General Dynamics Corporation*; Eugene E. Myers, *U. S. Air Force*; H. Hardy Perritt, *University of Alabama*.

ADULT EDUCATION

Ernest S. Brandenburg, *Washington University*; E. C. Buchler, *University of Kansas*; Thomas L. Dahle, *Michigan State University*; Charles T. Estes, *Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service*; Harold O. Haskitt, Jr., *General Motors Institute*; James N. Holm, *Kent State University*; David Potter, *Michigan State University*; Wesley Wiksell, *Louisiana State University*; Harold P. Zelko, *Pennsylvania State University*.

SPEECH CORRECTION

Ralph E. Frybarger, *Caddo Parish School System*; W. H. Perkins, *University of Southern California*; Oliver M. Skalbeck, *Sacramento State College*; Wayne L. Thurman, *Eastern Illinois State College*.

DEPARTMENTAL EDITORS

BOOK REVIEWS, L. LeRoy Cowperthwaite, *Kent State University*.

IN THE PERIODICALS, Annetta L. Wood, *Douglass College*.

AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS, Jon Hopkins, *Eastern Illinois State College*.

THE BULLETIN BOARD, Waldo Phelps, *University of California at Los Angeles*.

The Speech Teacher is published four times a year in January, March, September, and November, by the Speech Association of America. Membership dues in the Speech Association of America are \$4.50 a year, of which \$4.25 is for a year's subscription to *The Speech Teacher*. Price of this issue is \$1.25. Publication office, Artcraft Press, 10 Watson Place, Columbia, Missouri. General offices, Department of Speech, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Editorial office, 9 Sixth Street Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office at Columbia, Missouri.

NOTE TO CONTRIBUTORS

Manuscripts of articles and correspondence concerning them should be addressed to the Editor, 9 Sixth Street Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Contributors desiring reprints of articles appearing in *The Speech Teacher* should communicate with Artcraft Press, Columbia, Missouri, not later than fifteen days before the date of issue.

COPYRIGHT 1957 by the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

LOREN R.
KENNETH
ELISE HA
JOHN E.
DONALD
HOWARD
HENRY L
WALDO V

J. JEFFE
OWEN M
KARL F.

PAUL BA
E
MILTON
DALLAS
E
JOHN E
WILLAR
ELISE H
ORVILL
I
CHARLE
EDYTH
KARL R
I

SPEECH ASSOCIATION of AMERICA

Founded, 1914
Incorporated, 1950

OFFICERS

LOREN REID, <i>President</i>	University of Missouri
KENNETH G. HANCE, <i>Executive Vice-President</i>	Michigan State University
ELISE HAHN, <i>First Vice-President</i>	University of California at Los Angeles
JOHN E. DIETRICH, <i>Second Vice-President</i>	The Ohio State University
DONALD C. BRYANT, <i>Editor, The Quarterly Journal of Speech</i>	Washington University
HOWARD GILKINSON, <i>Editor, Speech Monographs</i>	University of Minnesota
HENRY L. MUELLER, <i>Editor, The Speech Teacher</i>	University of Illinois
WALDO W. BRADEN, <i>Executive Secretary</i>	Louisiana State University

OFFICERS-ELECT

J. JEFFERY AUER, <i>Executive Vice-President-Elect</i>	University of Virginia
OWEN M. PETERSON, <i>Executive Secretary-Elect</i>	Louisiana State University
KARL F. ROBINSON, <i>Editor-Elect, The Speech Teacher</i>	Northwestern University

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

Term Expires 1957

PAUL BAGWELL, <i>Executive Vice-President, 1952-1954;</i> <i>Ex Officio, 1955-1957</i>	Michigan State University
MILTON DICKENS, <i>Elected by SAA, 1954</i>	University of Southern California
DALLAS C. DICKEY, <i>Editor, The Speech Teacher, 1952-1954;</i> <i>Ex Officio 1955-1957</i>	University of Florida
JOHN E. DIETRICH, <i>Second Vice-President</i>	The Ohio State University
WILLARD J. FRIEDERICH, <i>Elected by SAA, 1954</i>	Marietta College
ELISE HAHN, <i>First Vice-President</i>	University of California at Los Angeles
ORVILLE A. HITCHCOCK, <i>Executive Secretary of SAA, 1951-1954;</i> <i>Ex Officio, July, 1954-June, 1957; Chairman of Finance Committee</i>	State University of Iowa
CHARLES A. MCGLON, <i>Elected by SAA, 1954</i>	Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
EDYTH RENSHAW, <i>Elected by SAA, 1954</i>	Southern Methodist University
KARL R. WALLACE, <i>President of SAA, 1954;</i> <i>Ex Officio, 1955-1957; Member of Finance Committee</i>	University of Illinois

Term Expires 1958

- BARNARD HEWITT, Elected by SAA, 1955 University of Illinois
 T. EARLE JOHNSON, Elected by SAA, 1955 University of Alabama
 EVELYN KONIGSBERG, Elected by SAA, 1955 Washington Irving High School, New York City
 THOMAS A. ROUSSE, President of SAA, 1955; University of Texas
 Ex Officio, 1956-1958
 CLARENCE T. SIMON, Elected by SAA, 1955 Northwestern University

Term Expires 1959

- J. JEFFERY AUER, Editor, *Speech Monographs*, 1954-1956; University of Virginia
 Ex Officio, 1957-1959
 ROBERT D. CLARK, Elected by SAA, 1956 University of Oregon
 WILBUR SAMUEL HOWELL, Editor, *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, Princeton University
 1954-1956; Ex Officio, 1957-1959
 KARL F. ROBINSON, Elected by SAA, 1956 Northwestern University
 LESTER THONSSSEN, President of SAA, 1956; College of the City of New York
 Ex Officio, 1957-1959

Term Expires 1960

- WALDO W. BRADEN, Executive Secretary of SAA, 1954-1957; Louisiana State University
 Ex Officio July, 1956-June, 1960
 KENNETH G. HANCE, Executive Vice-President; Michigan State University
 Ex Officio, 1958-1960
 HENRY L. MUELLER, Editor, *The Speech Teacher*, 1955-1957; University of Illinois
 Ex Officio, 1958-1960
 OWEN M. PETERSON, Executive Secretary of SAA, Louisiana State University
 July 1957-June 1960
 LOREN D. REID, President of SAA, 1957; University of Missouri
 Ex Officio, 1958-1960

Term Expires 1962

- DONALD C. BRYANT, Editor, *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, Washington University
 1957-1959; Ex Officio, 1960-1962
 HOWARD GILKINSON, Editor, *The Speech Monographs*, 1957-1959; University of Minnesota
 Ex Officio, 1960-1962

08.35
747
01.6

269
8879
New

The Speech Teacher

Vol. VI · JANUARY, 1957 · No. 1



The Ethics of Debating Both Sides	<i>Richard Murphy</i>	1
On Defining Communication	<i>Thomas R. Nilsen</i>	10
✓ A "Discography" of Commercially Recorded Speeches	<i>Gordon L. Thomas and David Potter</i>	18
Teaching Speech in a Liberal Arts Program for Young Executives	<i>Victor M. Powell</i>	27
Televised Forensics	<i>Wayne E. Brockriede and David B. Strother</i>	30
✓ Meeting Speech Needs in the Public Schools: The Speech Program in a Teachers College	<i>Ellen Kauffman</i>	36
Oral Communication in Elementary School Living	<i>Mardel Ogilvie</i>	43
Co-operation between High School and College in the Teaching of Oral Interpretation	<i>Ralph N. Schmidt</i>	48
✓ What Can Courses in Radio and Television Writing Accomplish?	<i>Edgar E. Willis</i>	55
✓ A <u>Listening</u> Course for High School Seniors	<i>Ralph Renwick, Jr.</i>	59
The Power of an Air Wave	<i>Wildon Stirtz</i>	63
Tournaments: For Better or Worse?	<i>Grace Walsh</i>	65
The Forum		68

Book Reviews

American Public Addresses, 1740-1952	<i>George V. Bohman</i>	71
Speech for You	<i>Freda Kenner</i>	72
Effective Speaking in Business	<i>Earnest Brandenburg</i>	72
Basic Public Speaking	<i>James N. Holm</i>	73
Practical American English for Students from Other Lands	<i>A. T. Cordray</i>	74
Guide to American English	<i>Eleanor McCann</i>	74
Handbook for Speech Improvement	<i>John R. Montgomery</i>	75
The Art of Interpretative Speech: Principles and Practices of Effective Reading	<i>L. LaMont Okey</i>	75
Helping the Bible Speak: How to Read the Bible Aloud More Effectively	<i>Fred J. Barton</i>	76
Form and Idea in Modern Theatre	<i>Bedford Thurman</i>	77
Your Tape Recorder	<i>R. S. Brubaker</i>	78
In the Periodicals		79
Audio-Visual Aids		83
The Bulletin Board		86

Vol. VI

"Is it
wrote.
1924.
college
suppor
less of
tionab
Senato
of mar
its of d
The
from
in his
was "e
at Ha
ing."
pathy
each s
propo
out th
main

Th
partis
deep.
conv

Richa
Unive
Debat
versity
nois.
of the
and
[Higl

1
Houg
2
(New
p. 28

The SPEECH TEACHER

Vol. VI, No. 1

January, 1957

THE ETHICS OF DEBATING BOTH SIDES

Richard Murphy

"Is it not risky to ignore the ethical?" wrote Senator Albert J. Beveridge in 1924. "The practice in high schools and colleges of appointing debating teams to support or oppose propositions, regardless of what the debaters believe, is questionable—indeed, bad,"¹ he declared. Senator Beveridge's comment is only one of many that one might cull on the merits of debating in disregard of conviction. The contemporary controversy dates from Theodore Roosevelt's declaration in his *Autobiography* in 1913 that he was "exceedingly glad" that as a student at Harvard he never "practiced debating." He had "not the slightest sympathy with debating contests in which each side is arbitrarily assigned a given proposition and told to maintain it without the least reference to whether those maintaining it believe in it or not."²

The controversy has had its worthy partisans on both sides, and feelings run deep. Opponents of debating against conviction are adamant in their posi-

tion, and, so far as I am aware, partisans of the debate-both-sides practice are equally one-sided in their belief. There are, of course, variations in individual practice. Woodrow Wilson as a senior in college refused to participate in a prize debate when drawing lots put him on the side opposite his belief. But as a debate counsellor at Princeton, he once advised a debater not to worry about opposing his own conviction, but to center on his opposition to Harvard.³ And there have been vogues in the practice. By 1917, O'Neill, Laycock, and Scales, although defending debating against conviction, noted that since colleges then had both affirmative and negative teams, "... it probably very rarely happens that a student who has ardent convictions talks against them in an inter-collegiate contest."⁴ In 1930, Dayton McKean, writing about Woodrow Wilson's attitude on the matter, explained that "debating both sides" is "a method now generally abandoned."⁵ As recently as 1951, Ewbank and Auer, defending debating against conviction under certain conditions, observed that "There seems no good reason for assuming that

Richard Murphy is Professor of Speech at the University of Illinois. He has been Director of Debate at the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Colorado, and the University of Illinois. He has served on the Speech Committee of the Pennsylvania Forensic and Music League and as Executive Secretary of the Colorado [High School] State Debating League.

¹ *The Art of Public Speaking* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924), pp. 23-24.

² *Theodore Roosevelt: An Autobiography* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913), p. 28.

³ Dayton D. McKean, "Woodrow Wilson as a Debate Coach," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XVI (November, 1930), 460.

⁴ James Milton O'Neill, Craven Laycock, and Robert Leighton Scales, *Argumentation and Debate* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917), p. 376.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*

debaters are commonly forced to debate against their convictions."⁶

But with the firm establishment of the tournament system, which received its greatest impetus in the thirties, there has been a growing tendency not only to ignore conviction and side, but also to incorporate debating both sides as a part of the structure. For example, the West Point National Invitational Tournament requires that "Teams debate opposite sides of question an equal number of times."⁷ Whereas in the older systems policy was largely a matter of individual schools and coaches, now one either debates both sides or he does not debate at all, or at least not in tournaments such as the West Point. An ethic has now been imposed.

In a rather objective review of what has happened to debate, a well-known political scientist, James MacGregor Burns, describes "modern debating" as primarily a system of contests. "Student debaters ordinarily do not choose their own sides." He asks, "What would Roosevelt say today if he could see the nationally chosen debate topics, with debating teams shifting from side to side with hardly a change in pace?"⁸ One answer has come from a veteran debate coach, Brooks Quimby of Bates College, who asks abandonment of the debate-both-sides policy.⁹

When there is such a sharp disagreement among worthy men, whose individual systems of ethics are presumably equally impeccable, there must be some

misunderstanding, some difference in purpose, or some failure to focus on the essence of the matter. It is with the thought that a close analysis may help to clarify the dispute, rather than to add to the literature of the controversy, that I write. For years I have listened to the arguments for debating both sides, and I have read all I could find on the question. But consistent with the position I have always held, that debating both sides is of doubtful virtue, I must in all honesty set down the case against it.

The argument against debating both sides is very simple and consistent. Debate, the argument goes, is a form of public speaking. A public statement is a public commitment. Before one takes the platform, he should study the question, he should discuss it until he knows where he stands. Then he should take that stand. If, in the course of the long-term debate, one finds that he has changed his conviction, he is free to cross the floor, to change his party, to do what seems consistent with his honest conviction. As Beveridge put it, public speaking "means, of course, utter sincerity. Never under any circumstances or for any reward tell an audience what you, yourself, do not believe or are even indifferent about. To do so is immoral and worse—it is to be a public liar."¹⁰ Or, as Brooks Quimby puts the matter, "Our democracy" needs "men and women of principle, who will weigh the arguments and evidence carefully before they become advocates," rather than "men and women trained to take either side at the flip of a coin."¹¹ As Theodore Roosevelt stated it, "What we need is to turn out of our colleges young men with ardent convictions on the side of the right, not young men who can make

⁶ Henry Lee Ewbank and J. Jeffery Auer, *Discussion and Debate: Tools of a Democracy* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951), p. 389.

⁷ *Tenth West Point National Invitational Debate Tournament* (West Point: United States Military Academy, 1956), p. 20.

⁸ "Debate Over Collegiate Debate," *The New York Times Magazine*, 5 December, 1954, 30.

⁹ "But Is It Educational?" *Speech Activities*, IX (Summer, 1953), 30-31.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 20.

¹¹ *Loc. cit.*

a good
wrong a

In re
the del
many
swers c
The m
is the r
form,
sides.

John S
of Tho
gued, 'the ex
is robb
gumen
subject
is poss
ance
conflic
testing
in wh
sented
sented

Any v
assert
puted
freed
that
any c
foll
mean
to un
does
press
men
conv
lic d
avoi
pres
ing
ing
cuss
fran
one

a good argument for either right or wrong as their interest bids them."¹²

In reply to these simple arguments, the debate-both-sides proponents have many answers. One of the sets of answers can be classified as philosophical. The most frequent of these arguments is the necessity of a free and open platform, with no silencing of unpopular sides. There may be applications of John Stuart Mill's essay, "Of the Liberty of Thought and Discussion." As Mill argued, "... the peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is, that it is robbing the human race." Or the argument may be put thus, "... on every subject on which difference of opinion is possible, the truth depends on a balance to be struck between two sets of conflicting reasons." There is no contesting the usefulness of the debate form, in which unpopular sides may be presented because the popular side is presented to counterbalance and correct. Any valid action to keep inquiry free, to assert the essential debatability of disputed questions, is a contribution to our freedom of expression. But it is not clear that one team's debating both sides has any connection with such a policy. If one follows Mill's full recommendation, it means a policy of tolerating, attempting to understand the utterance of views one does not hold, rather than one of expressing them oneself. Mill recommended "... acting ... on conscientious conviction." The "real morality of public discussion," Mill thought, consists in avoiding sophistic argument, or suppressing facts or arguments, or misstating elements in the case, or misrepresenting opposite opinion. The moral discussor, on the other hand, is tolerant, frank, and fair. It is difficult to see how one can debate both sides and avoid

Mill's list of malpractices or attain to his set of moral practices.

Since debate questions are purposely framed to provide a division of opinion, there should be available speakers on either side of the matter, speakers who really believe their own arguments. To do justice to arguments, Mill thought, and to bring them into real contact with our own minds, we "must be able to hear them from persons who actually believe them, who defend them in earnest, and do their very utmost for them." If for some reason a position has to be taken that no one present believes, there are devices for indicating the position taken is not of personal conviction. Socrates, when pressed to present a case he did not believe, spoke with his face covered that he might not offend the gods. But when he spoke his conviction, he spoke with head bare, no longer muffled for shame.¹³ Since 1587, the Sacred Congregation of Rites has used a Devil's Advocate as a means of testing arguments in the process of canonization. The various devices of the *advocatus diaboli* are, of course, only a substitute for the devil himself, who, however pervasive, is not always available for a specific appearance. But these devices do permit making a case in its strongest form without the violation of any ethical principles.

A second philosophical argument is that it is necessary to understand both sides of an argument, and debating both sides helps one to understand both sides. On this point Robert Louis Stevenson is sometimes quoted:

The best means of all towards catholicity is that wholesome rule which some folk are most inclined to condemn,—I mean the law of *obliged speeches*. Your senior member commands; and you must take the affirmative or the negative, just as suits his best convenience. . . . As the rule stands, you are saddled with the side

¹² *Loc. cit.*

¹³ *Phaedrus*, 237, 243.

you disapprove, and so you are forced . . . to argue out, to feel with, to elaborate completely the case as it stands against yourself.¹⁴

Such a practice, Stevenson thought, would teach cocksure young students some humility. No doubt the practice is a useful device for the purpose. But Stevenson was speaking of procedure in "a private club," as opposed to speaking in "a public place," and with fond memories of his days in The Speculative Society at Edinburgh. And he was not recommending a method of systematically debating both sides. Certainly a blind, intolerant partisanship is a horrible quality, and if there were no other way of seeing many views than debating for them, the practice might have to be tolerated on this count alone. But there are so many ways of seeing other views. The debater can brief the other side. He can explore the other side, and read about it. In actual debate, one can listen to the other side if he will but open his ears and mind. The position of the other side can be accurately stated for purposes of refutation where it seems to be in error, or for purposes of admission where it seems to be correct. To argue that the way to discover an idea is to get up on the platform and advocate it is rather unusual pedagogy. To argue that if one does not talk against his convictions he will be ignorant of opposing views is to ignore a basic rhetorical principle that the speaker should read, and discuss, and inquire, and test his position before he takes the platform to present it. As Mill put it, "He who knows only his own side of the case, knows little of that." And he commended Cicero's practice, as a "means of forensic success," of studying "his adversary's case with as great, if not still greater, intensity than even his own."

¹⁴ "Debating Societies," in *College Papers*.

A third philosophical argument is that it is never clear on which side the truth lies; hence all positions can be maintained with equal intensity. Addison's Sir Roger de Coverley is quoted to the effect that "much might be said on both sides." Sir Roger, of course, was dodging a judgment on a personal dispute about fishing, but even in this trivial matter he showed his usual sage judgment. That is why we argue a matter: there is a case on each side. But this is only the beginning. The end is to discover where the truth lies. A variation of this argument is the definition of truth as what can gain acceptance, regardless of what the advocates may believe. Boswell asked Dr. Johnson, ". . . whether, as a moralist, he did not think that the practice of the law, in some degree, hurt the fine feeling of honesty." Pressing the point, Boswell asked, "What do you think of supporting a cause which you know to be bad?" Johnson replied that one does "not know it to be good or bad until the judge determines it." Boswell asked whether "dissimulation" did not "impair one's honesty." Dr. Johnson was in his best form: "Sir, a man will no more carry the artifice of the bar into the common intercourse of society, than a man who is paid for tumbling upon his hands will continue to tumble up on his hands when he should walk on his feet."¹⁵ Dr. Johnson was, of course, applying a kind of eighteenth-century laissez-faire ethic to legal disputation, and a method he himself seldom followed, since he rarely had difficulty discovering for himself what the universal and eternal truth of any matter was. But to argue in contemporary times that a public speaker who has read and discussed his question shall not bring to the deliberation any per-

¹⁵ James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, Chap. XIX.

sonal conviction, but shall leave it to an audience which may never have heard the matter deliberated before, is to resign the moral responsibility of the speaker.

A fourth philosophical argument is that debaters themselves do not know what they believe. "My debaters," says one coach, "didn't know at the end of the season what side they were on." Their uncertainty is understandable. If one argues at nine o'clock that he and his colleague are firmly convinced of one side of an issue, and at ten that he is convinced of its opposite, and keeps up this shifting of advocacy for a season, it would be remarkable indeed if he really knew what to believe.

A fifth philosophical argument is that the debaters are too young to take a position on questions of public affairs. "How can an immature high school student know what our policy should be on parity prices?" a defender of both-sides debating asks. If students are debating questions over their heads, then the subjects should be simplified. But if the student is incompetent to take one position, he is certainly all the more incompetent to take two. However, we should not underestimate the intellectual capacity of our debaters, nor should we overlook the growing tendency to reduce the voting age. Debaters are either voters, or about to be, and as such will have to take positions on complex social and economic problems.

A sixth philosophical argument is that it is the function of neither the school nor the debate coach to turn out persons "with ardent convictions on the side of the right." It is sufficient to train them to think logically, and to see both sides. But the school and the teacher must have some responsibility for inducing conviction on such matters as freedom of speech, democracy, and integrity

of ideas. True, we do not instruct the student how to vote for dogcatcher, but should we not give him a methodology for finding an answer in a disputed matter? The person who does nothing to determine the ballot before election day, and then enters the polling booth able only to see both sides, is not a completely useful citizen.

A seventh philosophical argument is that debating both sides, through dissociating a student from belief, teaches him the essentials of rigorous, logical thinking. It gives him skill in using facts and inferences, and in thinking accurately. If he waives belief, he may be able to think purely, his mind unclouded by prejudice and predisposition. And if he demonstrates that he is so well informed and so superior to conviction that he can debate either side on the call of a chairman, he has reached the nirvana of scientific method. Now, training in logical methods is not to be disparaged, but is not the end result the discovery of what truth the logical inferences seem to illuminate, and what position one can most validly maintain under the circumstances? Why stop the logical process before the final goal has been reached?

An eighth philosophical argument is that "lawyers do it." Even Theodore Roosevelt allowed that lawyers may have to take an assigned proposition and argue it without relation to conviction. The debaters are advocates, the explanation goes, presenting arguments now for, now against, a proposition, that an audience may see the truth. It is not quite clear, in this argument, why an audience would gain more from hearing a question debated by persons not necessarily believing their sides, than by hearing debaters of deep conviction. However, the right of a lawyer to take an unpopular case, to be permitted to make it as

strongly as he can, and to suffer no social ostracism for his action, is a very precious development in social tolerance, and should not be impinged in any way. But the connection between this virtue and debating both sides is not very close. By "advocate" is meant ordinarily one who represents another in his view, or pleads his own belief. There seems to be some confusion concerning what lawyers actually do. One view is that lawyers must argue for or against a given proposition whether they want to or not. But Canon 31 of the *Canons of Professional Ethics* of the American Bar Association specifies that the lawyer "has the right to decline employment."¹⁶ Canon 30 states that "the lawyer must decline to conduct a civil case or to make a defense when convinced that it is intended merely to harass or to injure the opposite party."¹⁷ In other words, the lawyer is supposed to show personal judgment in taking a case, and he is not to take one merely for the sake of a suit or an argument. The Canon continues, "His appearance in Court should be deemed equivalent to an assertion on his honor that in his opinion his client's case is one proper for judicial determination."¹⁸ By analogy one could maintain that since debate questions are debatable, anyone could with honor uphold either side. But this contention would be a distortion of the theory. In a debatable matter, a case may honorably be made on both sides, but not usually by the same person. Clarence Darrow could with honor maintain that his clients should be sentenced to life imprisonment rather than to death. He could not, with honor, argue on a following day that they should be electrocuted. Applying this principle to de-

bating, cases may honorably be made on both sides, but not ordinarily by the same person.

Another form of the argument that debating both sides is justifiable because it conforms to legal practice is that lawyers must represent both sides. Now, if anything is certain in the legal-forensic system, it is that an advocate shall not represent conflicting interests. "It is unprofessional," reads Canon 6, "to represent conflicting interests, except by express consent of all concerned given after a full disclosure of the facts." The lawyer, according to the Canon, must "represent the client with undivided fidelity."¹⁹ Nor may the lawyer, under the *Canons*, pose as an objective seeker of truth if he represents an interest: "It is unprofessional for a lawyer so engaged [in advocacy] to conceal his attorneyship" [Canon 26].²⁰ These principles in the forensic system should not be confused, of course, with methods in conciliation and mediation in which a person without interest attempts to resolve conflict. The conflict of interest principle is a practical matter, not merely an abstract canon. When in 1955 it was revealed in the hundred-million-dollar Dixon-Yates contract that one person had been representing both interests without clear declaration, that element became a major issue in the President's cancellation of the whole contract.

A ninth philosophical argument is that debating is not public speaking, and hence not subject to the ethics of the platform, but is "educational forensics." This terminology has led to many quips, such as "It may be forensic, but is it educational?" But to state the argument fairly, it goes something like this: The method of disputing a question on both sides is an old educational

¹⁶ *Canons of Professional Ethics* (Chicago: American Bar Association, 1948), p. 18.

¹⁷ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁸ *Loc. cit.*

¹⁹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 9.

²⁰ *Loc. cit.*, p. 12.

device,
modern
is equip
he has
opposi
quently
other ti
So pra
ready r
Exer
alyze,
compre
puted
the ed
has re
which
uphol
the o
piece'
to dev
all sy
a clos
room
rather
the c
meth
sayin
what
in th
denc
class
one,
B
othe
lect
form
lect
not
and
pol
use
in
to

device, used in ancient, medieval, and modern times. No man can say that he is equipped to defend a position until he has demonstrated he can defend the opposite. Furthermore, in life one frequently has to present a case for, or at other times, a case against, a proposition. So practice in disputation makes the ready man.

Exercises which train a student to analyze, study lines of argument, or to comprehend and resolve or decide disputed matters may have their place in the educational process. Kenneth Burke has recently suggested an exercise in which the student writes "two debates, upholding first one position and then the other." He then writes "a third piece" to analyze what he has done and to develop "a distrustful admiration of all symbolism."²¹ The methods used in a closed debating society or in a classroom may be judged by pedagogical, rather than ethical, standards. But since the development of Whately's "natural method," that one learns to talk best by saying what one means and by meaning what one says, there has been a decline in the use of artificial devices. The tendency has been to make the club and classroom speaking situation an actual one, rather than make-believe.

But modern debating is something other than a medieval exercise in dialectic. It is geared to the public platform and to rhetorical, rather than dialectical, principles. The questions are not speculative or universal, but specific and timely, concerning practical public policy. The debater relies heavily on the use of authority and opinion, whereas in logical disputation an argument has to be taken on its merits. The debater

uses *ethos*, a rhetorical element: "So my colleague and I ask you to agree with us." And the modern debater makes an appeal for judgment by his audience or his critic. The contemporary debater is often ill-equipped to carry on a logical disputation; he may not know one mood of the syllogism from another; but he does know certain forms of rhetoric.

Besides, much has happened since the days of medieval and Renaissance disputation. The role of the citizen in public affairs has been greatly expanded, and public discussion has become an instrument of public policy. The debater, presumably, in addition to disputing at tournaments, speaks before school assemblies, at the student council, to service clubs, and at a number of organizations of which he is a member. He is judged there, not on his ability to present both sides, but upon his honest conviction. If at such meetings it were revealed that the day before he took an opposite view, he would lose his audience.

In addition to the philosophical arguments I have considered, there are in defense of debating both sides many claims for the device in terms of administrative procedure. One argument is that if actual debates are not held until students have decided their beliefs, the program of practice will be delayed. But one may point out that many forms of speaking other than debating are available for early season work. Panels, reports, symposiums, questioning of visiting experts can be used to open a subject and to supply the motivation which comes from having to speak. A second argument is that an early debate helps to open a question, reveal the issues, and give a touch of realism to the program. If this be so, there could be little objection to an early scrub debate to feel out the question. The objection

²¹ "The Linguistic Approach to Problems of Education," *Fifty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955), I, 287.

is not that on an occasion or so someone debates just for the fun of it; the objection is to systematizing debating both sides as a forensic method. A third argument is that having a two-, rather than a four-man, debate team means less cost in travel and wider school participation in tournaments. A fourth argument is that a two-man both-sides arrangement permits a school to groom its two best debaters to represent it. A fifth is that regional and national champion debaters can be selected in the method, rather than mere school or side champions. These and other arguments of convenience in programming are obvious advantages in a competitive tournament system, if one cares for such a system. Whether or not they are to be used will depend on one's views of the philosophical and ethical matters.

Before summarizing the view I present here, it might be useful to clear away a matter which seems to cause some confusion. That is whether or not arguing both sides is an essential element in debating. Many people seem to feel that it is. One director of debating, in a balance sheet of good and bad in the method of debate, lists "arguments on both sides of the proposition" as one of the "most important aspects of debate." He then lists on the liability side of debate "a certain professionalism which leads students to argue either side of any question without regard to the intrinsic merits of the ideas." This practice, he thinks, leads "either to sheer hypocrisy or to a certain paralysis of decision which prevents a person from ever making up his mind."²² Another writer thinks "much good is to be derived from having students debate both sides," but laments that the practice causes poor public relations. She gives the exam-

ple of the debater who made such an eloquent case for federal world government in a radio speech that he was invited to join the movement by a local group. They were somewhat puzzled when, a week later, he made an equally moving speech on the other side. She recommends early-season practice tournaments on both sides with sessions "closed to all persons outside forensic circles." After the secret sessions, the debaters come out and debate their convictions before the public, free from reproach.²³

Actually, the both-sides methodology is not now and never has been an essential element in debate, although it may have been in certain systems of disputation. The form of debate most generally practiced, parliamentary, never has used the method. Nor has the practice been used in debate as a form of public address. Lincoln and Douglas did not shift from side to side as they journeyed through Illinois. Nor has it been an essential even in debating societies. The Oxford Union and the Cambridge Union have managed through two centuries to do without the practice. In my own experience in debating from grade school through graduate college I never had a coach who followed, or would even tolerate, the system. To believe that to debate one must debate both sides is to ignore what actual practice is.

But what are the ethics of debating both sides? If one conceives of debating as a closed club activity in which a rhetorical-dialectical exercise is used for some purpose, then perhaps the method can be judged in terms of pedagogy, rather than of ethics. But insofar as debating is public speaking, insofar as debating is a method of the platform, it will have to submit to the contemporary ethic, which is that a public ut-

²² Wilder W. Crane, Jr., "The Function of Debate," *The Central States Speech Journal*, V (Fall, 1953), 16-17.

²³ Evelyn Kenesson de Voros, "The Purpose of College Debate," *Western Speech*, XVIII (May, 1954), 191, 194.

terance is a public commitment. Nor, if the view presented in this survey is correct, can the practice be justified as realistic training for the practice of the law. Debate would be in a stronger position if it were freed from the anachronistic practice of multiple positions. And those who believe in the essential processes of democratic debate, and wish to extend them, would no longer be held

liable for a dubious practice, if the debate-both-sides policy were abandoned.

Now, in harmony with one established practice, let one of the men who opened, close. Said Theodore Roosevelt, "To admire the gift of oratory without regard to the moral quality behind the gift is to do wrong to the republic."²⁴

²⁴ Address at the Sorbonne, 23 April, 1910.

EXCURSUS

II. FALLING INFLECTION

RULE I.—The falling inflection is generally proper, wherever the sense is complete . . .

The falling of the voice at the close of a sentence is sometimes called a cadence, and properly speaking, there is a slight difference between it and the falling inflection, but for all practical purposes they may be considered as one and the same. It is of some importance, and requires attention to be able to close a sentence gracefully. The ear, however, is the best guide on this point.

Parts of a sentence often make complete sense in themselves, and in this case, unless qualified or restrained by the succeeding clause, or unless the contrary is indicated by some other principle, the falling inflection takes place, according to the rule . . .

Exception.—When a sentence concludes with a negative clause, or with a contrast or comparison, (called also antithesis), the first member of which requires the falling inflection, it must close with the rising inflection. . . .

In such cases, as the falling inflection is required in the former part, by the principle of contrast and emphasis, (called also antithesis), the first member of which requires the falling inflection, it must close with the rising inflection. . . .

Remark.—As a sentence generally ends with the falling inflection, harmony and variety of sound seem to require, that the *last but one* should be the *rising inflection*. Such, in fact, is the very common custom of speakers, even though this part of the sentence, where the rising inflections would fall, should form complete sense. This principle may, therefore, be considered as sometimes giving authority for exception to the rule. . . .

In many cases, however, it may be necessary that one or the other of these principles should give way. Which of them should yield, in any given case, must depend upon the construction of the sentence, the nature of the style and subject, and often, upon the taste of the speaker.—William H. McGuffey, *McGuffey's Newly Revised Eclectic Fourth Reader: Containing Elegant Extracts in Prose and Poetry, with Rules for Reading, and Exercises in Articulation, Defining, etc.* (Cincinnati: Wm. B. Smith & Company, 1853), pp. 15-17.

ON DEFINING COMMUNICATION

Thomas R. Nilsen

THE meaning of the word "communication" is at once both clear and obscure. It is clear enough in conventional usage, but obscure when we seek to determine the limits of its application. To illustrate, if someone talks to another and common understanding results (indicated by mutually satisfactory action), we have no qualms about saying that communication has occurred. If, however, misunderstanding results (indicated by mutually unsatisfactory action), we are uncertain whether we should say that there has been poor, or no, communication. Further, if someone does not talk to another and the latter as a result gains certain impressions of the former, has communication occurred? Would it make any difference whether the first person deliberately did not talk or unintentionally failed to talk? If someone eavesdrops on a conversation, is he receiving communication? If from the antics of my neighbor's children or from the condition of his house I draw certain conclusions about him, has there been a communication? If I classify a group of objects before me, say, several pieces of lumber, on the basis of certain characteristics, is there communication?

The problem is familiar. It seems impossible to draw a line between those situations that we conventionally term "communication" and those we do not, short of a purely arbitrary distinction.

This essay marks Dr. Nilsen's first appearance in *The Speech Teacher*. He is an Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Washington, where he earned his bachelor's and master's degrees. Northwestern University awarded him the Ph.D. in 1953.

And the many and varied definitions of "communication" appearing in the literature of various fields of study often appear, at first glance at least, to compound the difficulty.

We who are teaching speech must be concerned about defining communication. Certainly our concept of this process determines to no small degree our approach to speech training, how broadly or narrowly we view our subject, how we relate it to other areas of study. My purpose in this paper is to put the problem of defining "communication" in clearer perspective, thus assisting in the selection of a more consistent and pedagogically helpful concept of communication. To accomplish my purpose, I shall present a number of definitions of "communication" in a two-fold classification and examine the application of these definitions to a series of situations in which human responses and interactions occur. Such classification and application should give us some insights into the problem of definition, into the relationship among existing definitions, and provide us with the perspective necessary to select the most basic, consistent, and useful definition of "communication," and to see its relationship to the process of speech.

I

Definitions of "communication" fall into two broad categories. In one category are those definitions which limit the process of communication to those stimulus-response situations in which one deliberately transmits stimuli to evoke response. In the other category

are those
the area
sponse s
not be
sponse
The sec
the first
The c
into th
group t
include
vide a
this ca
present
order c

Our
munic
tionar
cate"
or con
way o
course
course
tion;
is def
muni
letter
thou
other
ence.
W
the c
catic
B th
E.
tent
be
com

the
Mas
193
Mo
Me
Ins
ban
24.

are those definitions that include within the area of communication stimulus-response situations in which there need not be any intention of evoking response in the transmission of the stimuli. The second category obviously overlaps the first.

The definitions below I have grouped into these two categories. In the first group there is no particular sequence; I include the various definitions to provide a broad view of the definitions in this category. In the second group I present the definitions roughly in the order of their inclusiveness.

CATEGORY ONE

Our everyday usage of the word "communication" fits in here. Standard dictionary definitions reflect it. "Communicate" is defined as "To impart, bestow, or convey. . . . To make known; give by way of information. . . . To have intercourse, or to be the means of intercourse; to hold or afford communication; to converse. . . ." "Communication" is defined as "The act or fact of communicating. . . . Intercourse by words, letters or messages; interchange of thoughts or opinions, by conference or other means; converse; correspondence."¹

Wilbur Schramm gives what he terms the classical statement of the communication process as ". . . *A communicates B through channel C to D with effect E.* Each of these letters is to some extent an unknown, and the process can be solved for any one of them or any combination."² Similarly, Carl Hovland

states that communication is ". . . the process by which an individual (the communicator) transmits stimuli (usually verbal symbols) to modify the behavior of other individuals (communicatees)."³

Elaborating the process of communication more fully, Mapheus Smith states,

Communication behavior in its simplest reciprocal form is the use of some action by one person, whether or not accompanied by a material object, as a stimulus to another person in such a way that the second person can perceive the experience of the stimulating person. The overt action of the first person plays the role of a symbol whose reference or meaning is the same for the two participants, with the result that common experience is perceived by both participants.⁴

Smith uses the term "communicative behavior" because it focuses attention on the process of interbehavior.

Two other definitions are interesting additions to this category for the distinctions they draw between communication as interaction and other forms of interaction. Charles Morris writes,

The term communication, when widely used, covers any instance of the establishment of a commonage, that is, the making common of some property to a number of things. In this sense a radiator "communicates" its heat to surrounding bodies, and whatever medium serves this process of making common is a means of communication (the air, a road, a telegraph system, a language). For our purposes "communication" will be limited to the use of signs to establish a commonage of signification; the establishment of a commonage other than that of signification—whether by signs or other means—will be called *communization*.⁵

Thus, as Morris points out, the anger of one person may make another person

¹ Webster's *New International Dictionary of the English Language* (2d ed.) (Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1934), p. 541.

² Wilbur Schramm, ed., *Communications in Modern Society: Fifteen Studies of the Mass Media Prepared for the University of Illinois Institution of Communications Research* (Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1948), p. 24. (Italics in the original.)

³ Carl Hovland, "Social Communication," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, XCII (12 November, 1948), 371.

⁴ Mapheus Smith, "Communicative Behavior," *Psychological Review*, LIII (September, 1946), 294.

⁵ Charles Morris, *Signs, Language and Behavior* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1946), p. 118.

angry, and signs may not have established the commonage. This sort of situation he calls "communization." On the other hand, someone may signify anger, and, without becoming angry himself cause someone else to signify anger. An incident of this type he calls "communication."⁶

George Lundberg puts his definition this way:

We shall use the word communication, then, to designate interaction by means of signs and symbols. The symbols may be gestural, pictorial, plastic, verbal, or any other which operate as stimuli to behavior which would not be evoked by the symbol itself in the absence of special conditionings of the person who responds. Communication is, therefore, a subcategory under interaction, namely, the form of interaction which takes place through symbols.⁷

Lundberg adds that this definition is subject to certain qualifications. It is important to distinguish between "... communication and mere contact, or interaction whether on the verbal level or otherwise."⁸ "True societal communication consists of temporarily identifying oneself symbolically with the other as regards the particular situation involved in the communication."⁹ True communication, he says, is the kind of interaction through signs and symbols that leads to tension reduction or understanding. Similar interaction that leads to increasing tension is also communication, but of a different degree. It involves a different degree of symbolic identification.¹⁰

In the last two definitions above there is recognition of processes or areas of behavior very closely related to communication—the "communization" of

Morris and the "interaction without the use of signs and symbols" of Lundberg—but which, however, they carefully mark off from what is strictly called "communication." The excluded areas of behavior, in the present classification, would be included among the definitions in category two.

CATEGORY TWO

In this group are the definitions that include as communication situations those situations in which there is no intentional transmission of stimuli to evoke response. Two concepts of communication in this category are suggestive of the Morris and Lundberg definitions, but instead of excluding the closely related areas of behavior they include them as special kinds of communication. Edward Sapir, in defining communication, wrote of "explicit" and "implicit" communication. The former is communication in the conventional sense, the use of language to establish common understanding among people (a Category One definition); the latter is the "intuitive interpretation" of the "relatively unconscious symbolisms of gesture, and the unconscious assimilation of the ideas and behavior of one's culture,"¹¹ (which definition finds its place in Category Two). Baker Brownell used the terms "direct" and "indirect" communication. The latter is a "... process wherein something converted into symbols is carried over from one person to another."¹² This is conventional usage (Category One again). The former, direct communication, is a function of the "... identification of people with one another." This is communication with-

⁶ Loc. cit.

⁷ George Lundberg, *Foundations of Sociology* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939), p. 253.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 283.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 274.

¹⁰ Loc. cit.

¹¹ Edward Sapir, "Communication," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933), Vol. IV, p. 79.

¹² Baker Brownell, *The Human Community: Its Philosophy and Practice for a Time of Crisis* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 240.

out a symbolic medium; it is an identification of experience.¹³

Theodore Newcomb states that when someone gains certain impressions of someone else the latter is communicating something to the former. To use his example, the man who allows junk to accumulate in his front yard communicates something to his neighbor whether he knows it or not.¹⁴ An almost identical point of view is that of Jurgen Ruesch, who states that "... as used in our sense the concept of communication would include all those processes by which people influence one another."¹⁵ And in slightly different wording, Henry Lindgren expresses it, "Communication, viewed psychologically, is a process which is concerned with all situations involving meaning."¹⁶

Several years earlier Charles H. Cooley had foreshadowed this broad concept of communication:

By Communication is here meant the mechanism through which human relations exist and develop—all the symbols of the mind, together with the means of conveying them through space and preserving them in time. . . .

There is no sharp line between the means of communication and the rest of the external world. In a sense all objects and actions are symbols of the mind, and nearly anything may be used as a sign— . . .¹⁷

Some writers conceive of the term "communication" broadly enough to include non-human interactions. S. S. Ste-

vens, for instance, gives what he describes as a "... broad, operational, and behavioristic" definition of communication. He states:

Communication is the discriminatory response of an organism to a stimulus. . . .

This definition says that communication occurs when some environmental disturbance (the stimulus) impinges on an organism and the organism does something about it (makes a discriminatory response). If the stimulus is ignored by the organism, there has been no communication. The test is differential reaction of some sort. The message that gets no response is not a communication.¹⁸

Stevens adds that his definition includes the clucking of a mother hen that brings her chicks, as well as a treatise on the information theory of communication.

In Warren Weaver's definition the ultimate step is taken, to include the interaction of machines:

The word *communication* will be used here in a very broad sense to include all of the procedures by which one mind may affect another. . . . In some connections it may be desirable to use a still broader definition of communication, namely, one which would include the procedures by means of which one mechanism (say automatic equipment to track an airplane and to compute its probable future positions) affects another mechanism (say a guided missile chasing this airplane).¹⁹

With the above classification of definitions in mind, let us turn to an application of these definitions.

II

Let us picture an office in which several men are working at their desks. At midmorning the boss emerges from his private office and briefly talks with an employee. Let us assume that he gives the employee instructions to prepare a

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 241. Brownell adds that this sort of event may, in less well developed situations, occur among animals or between people and animals.

¹⁴ Theodore M. Newcomb, *Social Psychology* (New York: The Dryden Press, 1950), p. 269.

¹⁵ Jurgen Ruesch, "Values, Communication, and Culture," in Jurgen Ruesch and Gregory Bateson, *Communication: The Social Matrix of Psychiatry* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1951), pp. 5-6.

¹⁶ Henry C. Lindgren, *The Art of Human Relations* (New York: Hermitage House, 1953), p. 135.

¹⁷ Charles H. Cooley, *Social Organization: A Study of the Larger Mind* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), p. 61.

¹⁸ S. S. Stevens, "Introduction: A Definition of Communication," *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, XXII (November, 1950), 689.

¹⁹ Claude E. Shannon and Warren Weaver, *The Mathematical Theory of Communication* (Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1949), p. 95.

report, which the latter does, to the complete satisfaction of the boss. We can, without quibbling, say that in this case communication between the employer and the employee has occurred. We can also say that in this case communication has been successful. If the report had not been correct in every detail, because of some misunderstanding of the instructions, we would still say that communication had occurred, though not so successfully.

Now suppose the boss had stepped into the room, briefly looked around, and then returned to his office without having said a word or made a gesture designed to evoke a response. It seems reasonable to suppose that some of the employees would nevertheless respond. They might have wondered, for instance, if the employer were checking to see that everyone was busy. It seems apparent, moreover, that the responses of the employees might have been the same whether the boss had in fact been observing their work or not thinking about them at all. And yet again, if the employees had expected the boss to appear and had he not done so, his non-appearance would undoubtedly have evoked certain responses.

Let us imagine, to carry the hypothetical incident further, that one of the employees is working on a large chart. His desk is inconveniently small for his work; lack of space reduces his efficiency and makes his job appreciably more difficult. The employee might respond by feeling frustrated and angry. He might further begin to consider his small desk a threat to his prestige, and an indication of the small value the company places on his services. Still another employee might be finding his chair uncomfortable, and besides squirming around for an optimum adjustment to it, could well be thinking that the boss

feels little concern for the welfare and dignity of his employees.

These commonplace office situations, a moment's reflection will show, correspond to most, if not all, of the communication situations defined in the section above. There was transmission of stimuli to evoke response; there was an interchange of ideas; the use of signs established a commonage of signification; people interacted through the use of signs and symbols; and impressions of certain people—intended or unintended—were evoked in the minds of others. These doubtless were, in Sapir's terms, intuitive interpretations of gesture and unconscious assimilation of office culture. Also there may have been direct communication in Brownell's sense of the identification of people with one another, which perhaps could be illustrated by the common feelings toward the company. All were situations involving meaning. Moreover, we could class all as discriminatory responses to environmental stimuli.

If we apply our definitions by categories, we find that in terms of the definitions in Category One, only the first of the office situations described has the characteristics of a communication situation, that is, the one in which the boss instructed an employee to make a report. In none of the others was there a deliberate use of signs or symbols to influence behavior. All of these situations could, however, with the addition of the element of purpose, involve communication in the sense of Category One. Had the boss when he made his wordless appearance done so intentionally to evoke response, or had he intentionally not appeared when he knew his employees expected him to (the absence of a stimulus object in a certain context can be as meaningful as its presence), the definitions would apply. If the too-small

desk and
purposely
tion (to
that they
might
would n
uations
gory On

If we
on the
office si
municat
comb, l
ens, an
make o
commu
definiti
more d
parent
plicit"
situati
dividu
not in
such m

Wh
above
among
the s
place,
persp
"comm
attem
The
delin
comm
other
clude
tion
does
comm
gard
sion
direc
And
so b

desk and the inadequate chair had been purposely given to the men in question (to let them know, for instance, that they were not so important as they might have felt themselves to be) these would not have been communication situations in terms of definitions in Category One.

If we apply Category Two definitions, on the other hand, we find that all the office situations described involve communication. The definitions of Newcomb, Ruesch, Cooley, Lindgren, Stevens, and Weaver would quite plainly make of each of the office incidents a communication situation. The "split" definitions of Sapir and Brownell are more difficult to apply, but it seems apparent that their "implicit" and "explicit" concepts would include those situations that had meaning for the individuals involved although they were not intentionally structured to have such meaning.

III

What insights can we derive from the above definitions, the relationships among them, and their relationships to the situations described? In the first place, the classification itself gives us a perspective on the problem of defining "communication" by revealing various attempts to conceptualize the process. The classification reveals attempts to delineate certain types of interaction as communication to the exclusion of other types; it reveals attempts to include as a special kind of communication certain interactional behavior that does not fit the conventional concept of communication, and further, a disregard of such distinctions and the inclusion of all forms of human interaction, direct or indirect, as communication. And still further, it reveals definitions so broad that certain animal responses,

and even mechanical interactions, fall into the category of communication.

Secondly, the importance and value of viewing communication as response become apparent. It is evident from the classification and application of the definitions that in the first category the concept of the process of communication is from the point of view of the transmitter of stimuli, and in the second category, from the point of view of the person responding. Looking at the process of communication from the transmitter's point of view provides the most obvious method of delimiting the area of behavior to be treated as communication, and consequently simplifies the problem of definition. If someone is transmitting stimuli for the purpose of evoking response there is communication; otherwise there is none. This is certainly one basis for definition, but it leaves a large area of behavior—often indistinguishable from "communication" by the responder or an observer—inadequately related to it, and in a sense unaccounted for. Only the transmitter can know whether or not he is transmitting stimuli for the purpose of influencing the behavior of others.

When the process of communication is viewed from the perspective of the person responding, the above problem of what to do with the closely related behavior no longer exists. There seems to be no significant difference in the process of response whether or not it is to deliberately transmitted stimuli, and therefore no reason to classify the responses on this basis. To use the office examples again, in the non-verbal situations, if the responders had known whether or not the situations were intentionally structured, it might have made a difference in the behavior elicited, but this difference would have been the result of their having perceived the stimulus pat-

tern differently. Had they assumed intentional structure, then whether or not there was in fact intentional structure would have made no difference to their response.

There may appear to be a problem in viewing communication from the point of view of the responder when we proceed from people's influencing each other through words, actions, or man-made artifacts as communication to including as communication the individual's response to some object in the natural environment that human effort has in no way structured. Take, for instance, someone's responses to the moon. Yet, here again, apart from the very basic response of awareness, his reactions, intellectual and emotional, and the meanings he "sees" in the moon are a function of the influence of other minds; he is interacting, though indirectly, with other people.

Thirdly, we are able to select a basic and useful definition of "communication." The logical end result of accepting any of the definitions in Category Two is the acceptance of the broadest of the definitions, that of Stevens, which includes all instances of discriminatory response to environmental stimuli as communication (disregarding, of course, mechanical interaction as communication). As a basic definition this is the most satisfactory. It is inclusive of the other definitions, and it provides a perspective that permits us to see the relationships between the many other proposed definitions of communication.²⁰ Viewed from the perspective of this definition, the other definitions differ from each other on the basis of the range of response-evoking stimuli included in the communication situation. By the same

token, this definition permits us systematically to delineate areas of communicative behavior for purposes of study while keeping these limited areas of behavior in a consistent relationship to the total area of communicative behavior of which they are a functionally inseparable part. We can delineate these areas for study by delimiting the range of response-evoking stimuli that is to be included in a given communication situation. Thus we might include as communication only those responses to words, objects, or actions deliberately structured to evoke response in a given situation. We might include only responses to written words designed to "communicate" at a particular time. We might include only spoken words and bodily actions, or only spoken words, or spoken words in a face-to-face situation, depending upon what aspect of the human interaction we happen to be primarily interested in.

There can, of course, be no sharp line of demarcation between the responses defined as communicative and those that are not. There is, as Cooley stated, no sharp line between the means of communication and the rest of the external world. Moreover, delimiting the communication situation by limiting the range of response-evoking stimuli included does not cancel the effects of other stimuli. The individual is constantly making differential responses to a wide range of stimulus patterns, environmental and internal, responses which are often inextricably intermingled with the responses to the stimuli that would be, by definition in a given case, included within the area of communicative behavior. The process of limitation suggested here, however, makes possible a systematic approach to the problem of limited definition, and makes us more clearly aware of what we are including and excluding for pur-

²⁰ In this paper I have arbitrarily limited my discussion to a consideration of communication at the human level.

poses of
related t
The b
here poi
municat
ten serv
commun
which p
stimuli,
their re
must re

²¹ What
communi
one facto
mitting,
than and
a given
we may
source o
uli trans
receiver
or relati

poses of study and how these parts are related to each other.²¹

The broad, basic definition adopted here points to the basic nature of communicative behavior. While it may often serve our purpose to consider as communication situations only those in which people are responding to verbal stimuli, or rather, to consider primarily their responses to verbal stimuli, we must recognize the integral relationship

²¹What I have written about the process of communication in no way suggests that any one factor in the process of producing, transmitting, or receiving stimuli is more important than another. Within what may be defined in a given case as a "communication situation" we may single out for further analysis the source of the stimuli, the nature of the stimuli transmitted, the method of transmission, the receiver of the stimuli, the responses evoked, or relationships among these factors.

between such responses and responses to other stimuli.

The problem of defining "communication" is not unlike that of defining "education." In a sense, all learning experiences are educational (perhaps all experiences beyond reflex action), but to make learning more rapid and profitable we set up certain conditions of learning and in general limit the term "education" to an application to learning under such conditions. But to see what is conventionally termed "education" in the proper perspective we must see it in relationship to the vast number of other experiences of which it is a functionally inseparable part. And so, too, must we see communication, particularly that process of communication we call speech.

EXCURSUS

RULE II.—The tones of the voice should always correspond with the nature of the subject.

In our attempt to imitate nature it is important to avoid *affectation*, for, to this fault, even perfect monotony is preferable.

To improve the voice in all these respects, practice is necessary. To increase its *compass* or range of notes, commence, for example, with the lowest pitch the voice can comfortably sound, and repeat whole paragraphs and pages upon that key. Then rise one note higher, and practice on that, in the same way, then another, and so on, until the highest pitch of the voice is reached. The *strength* of the voice may be increased in the same way, by practicing with different degrees of *loudness*, from a whisper to full rotundity, taking care to keep the voice on the *same key*. The same note in music may be sounded *loud* or *soft*. So, also, a sentence may be pronounced on the same pitch with different degrees of loudness. Having practiced with different degrees of loudness on one key, make the same experiment on another, and then on another, and so on. It will be found, that the voice is capable of being changed and improved by exercise and practise to a much greater degree than is generally supposed.—William H. McGuffey, *McGuffey's Newly Revised Eclectic Fourth Reader: Containing Elegant Extracts in Prose and Poetry, with Rules for Reading, and Exercises in Articulation, Defining, etc.* (Cincinnati: Winthrop B. Smith & Company, 1853), pp. 12-13.

A "DISCOGRAPHY" OF COMMERCIALY RECORDED SPEECHES

Gordon L. Thomas and David Potter

THE compiler of bibliographies has, at best, a tedious task. But he usually knows the *date* of the utterance or publication and its *place*. Not so the compiler of a "discography" of recorded speeches. First, he finds that most companies do not bother to list the date or place of the speech; secondly, he can seldom find written evidence on the jacket of the album or in the record itself to testify whether the voice is that of the original speaker before the actual audience or of a reader orating to the tune of "canned" applause; and, finally, he frequently cannot tell, because of extreme editing, who the speaker is, or from what speech the excerpt comes.

The "discography" which follows is the result of much detective work and some conjecture. Necessarily it is not definitive, although it is fairly comprehensive. We have not included items we could not identify at least by speaker and speech, and we have omitted those recordings for which we could not supply record numbers. Whenever the re-

leases were available, we have checked their contents against the claims of the advertisers and the "blurbs" on the jackets.

In this "discography" each entry is listed as follows: Name of speech, place and date of speech, length of recording ("C" denotes the complete speech or at least one record face devoted to it; "E" denotes an excerpt of more than thirty seconds in length), name of the record or album, the recording company, and the number of the record or album. All recordings of less than thirty seconds' duration are listed as "fragments" at the end of the listing for each individual speaker.

ACHESON, DEAN. Fragment in *This is the U.N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.

AITKEN, WILLIAM MAXWELL, 1st Baron Beaverbrook. Fragment in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLP1.

ASQUITH, HERBERT H. "Budget Speech" (1909) (C). His Master's Voice, D379.

ATTLEE, CLEMENT R. "The Terms of Surrender" (14 August, 1945) (C). *Those Historic Years*. Panacoustic, H9485.

—. Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881. Also in *This is the U.N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.

AURIOL, VINCENT. "Welcoming the General Assembly" (Paris, 21 September, 1948) (E: 61 secs.). *This is the U.N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.

BALDWIN, STANLEY. "Tribute to the Memory of King George V" (1936) (C). His Master's Voice, C2819-2821.

BARKLEY, ALBEN W. Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.

BARNUM, P. T. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.

BARRYMORE, JOHN. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.

BARUCH, BERNARD. "The Quick and the Dead"

This "discography" is the first representation of its senior compiler in *The Speech Teacher*. His "Aaron Burr's Farewell Address" appeared in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* for October, 1953. Dr. Thomas is an Assistant Professor of Speech at Michigan State University. He received his A.B. from Albion College in 1936, his M.A. from [then] Michigan State College in 1941, and his Ph.D. from Northwestern University in 1952.

The junior compiler, of course, is well known to readers of *The Speech Teacher*. Currently one of its Consulting Editors, he was Audio-Visual Aids Editor for *The Speech Teacher's* first three years. Dr. Potter is an Associate Professor of Speech at Michigan State University. He took his B.S. and M.A. degrees at Rutgers University in 1937 and 1939, respectively. Columbia University awarded him the Ph.D. in 1943.

(New
Can H
— F
Produ
BECK, J
Pilgrim
(C). H
BENES, F
Harbo
BERENDS
U.N.
BEVIN, E
cil" (C
This
WA48
—
Lond
the U
BEY, M
U. N
BIDAULT
Tribu
BOURNE
(C). I
BRYAN,
(Chic
the
secs.)
An
tary
(E:
Serv
BUNCH
Tribu
BYRD,
tor,
BYRNE
the
CALDE
U.
CARN
Tribu
CATT,
Yea
CHAM
(Lo
I C
Als
Lon
ter
ten
ha
Pr
LL

- (New York, 14 June, 1946) (E: 50 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881.
- . Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- BECK, JAMES. "Conclusion of Speech to the Pilgrims' Club" (London, 28 November, 1918) (C). His Master's Voice, D366.
- BENES, EDUARD. Fragment in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- BERENDSON, CARL A. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- BEVIN, ERNEST. "Inauguration of Security Council" (London, January, 1946) (E: 31 secs.). *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- . Fragment in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1. Also in *This is the U. N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- BEY, MAHMOUD FAWZI. Fragment in *This is the U. N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- BIDAULT, GEORGES. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- BOURNE, FRANCIS CARDINAL. "Education" (1907) (C). His Master's Voice, E158.
- BRYAN, WILLIAM JENNINGS. "Cross of Gold" (Chicago, 8 July, 1896) (E: 32 secs.). *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282. Also (E: 2 min. 8 secs.). *If I'm Elected*. Heritage, LP A1201.
- . "Prince of Peace" (E: 2 min. 35 secs.). *An Anthology of Rhetoric*. B & B Documentary Records, B&B4.
- . "Freedom for the Philippines" (1901) (E: 2 min.). *Voices of Freedom*. Educational Services, E51.
- BUNCHE, RALPH. Fragment in *This is the U. N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- BYRD, HARRY. Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- BYRNES, JAMES FRANCIS. Fragment in *This is the U. N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- CALDERONE, FRANK. Fragment in *This is the U. N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- CARNES, GERALD. Fragment in *This is the U. N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- CATT, CARRIE CHAPMAN. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- CHAMBERLAIN, NEVILLE. "I Can Do No More" (London, 27 September, 1938) (E: 50 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also (E: 40 secs.). *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1. Also (C). His Master's Voice, C3031.
- . "Speech at Heston Airport" (30 September, 1938) (C). His Master's Voice, C3031.
- . "We Value Freedom More" (Birmingham, England, 17 March, 1939) (E: 35 secs.). *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- . Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- CHISHOLM, BROCK. Fragment in *This is the U. N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- CHURCHILL, WINSTON. "Budget Speech" (1909) (C). His Master's Voice, D379.
- . "General Election Speech" (1918) (C). His Master's Voice, D380.
- . "The Battle of the Plate" (London, 18 December, 1939) (E: 30 secs.). *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- . "Be Ye Men of Valor" (London, 19 May, 1940) (C). Gramophone JOX 33. Also (C). *Progress of the War*, Vol. I. His Master's Voice, GM348. Also (E: 45 secs.). *An Anthology of Rhetoric*. B & B Documentary Records, B&B4. Also (E: 43 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also (E: 30 secs.). *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- . "Their Finest Hour" (London, 18 June, 1940) (E: 37 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also (E: 45 secs.). *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1. Also (C). *Progress of the War*, Vol. I. His Master's Voice, GM348. Also (C). *Winston Churchill's Famous Broadcast Speeches*. Gramophone, JOX 34/36.
- . "War of the Unknown Warriors" (London, 14 July, 1940) (C). Gramophone, JOX 37/8. Also (E: 35 secs.). *An Anthology of Rhetoric*. B & B Documentary Records, B&B4. Also (C). *Progress of the War*, Vol. I. His Master's Voice, GM348.
- . "Every Man to His Post" (London, 11 September, 1940) (C). Gramophone, JOX 39. Also (C). *Progress of the War*, Vol. I. His Master's Voice, GM348.
- . "Frenchmen! Re-Arm Your Spirits" (21 October, 1940) (C). *Progress of the War*, Vol. II. His Master's Voice, GM356.
- . "To the Peoples of Italy" (23 December, 1940) (C). *Progress of the War*, Vol. II. His Master's Voice, GM356.
- . "Put Your Confidence in Us" (London, 9 February, 1941) (E: 40 secs.). *An Anthology of Rhetoric*. B & B Documentary Records, B&B4. Also (E: 47 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also (C). *Progress of the War*, Vol. II. His Master's Voice, GM356.
- . "Westward, Look, the Land Is Bright" (27 April, 1941) (E: 35 secs.). *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1. Also (C). *Progress of the War*, Vol. III. His Master's Voice, GM364.
- . "Broadcast to the Polish People" (3

- May, 1941 (E: 40 secs.). *An Anthology of Rhetoric*. B & B Documentary Records, B&B4.
- . "The German Invasion of Russia" (22 June, 1941) (E: 50 secs.). *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1. Also (C). *Progress of the War*, Vol. III. His Master's Voice, GM364.
- . "The Atlantic Charter" (24 August, 1941) (E: 1 min. 30 secs.). *An Anthology of Rhetoric*. B & B Documentary Records, B&B4. Also (C). *Progress of the War*, Vol. III. His Master's Voice, GM364.
- . "Japanese Treachery in the Pacific" (8 December, 1941) (C). *Progress of the War*, Vol. IV. His Master's Voice, GM370.
- . "Address to Congress and the Nation" (Washington, 26 December, 1941) (C). Columbia, C 851/2. Also (C). *Progress of the War*, Vol. IV. His Master's Voice, GM370.
- . "Address to the Canadian Parliament" (30 December, 1941) (C). *Progress of the War*, Vol. IV. His Master's Voice, GM370.
- . "Proclamation of Victory over Germans" (London, 8 May, 1945) (E: 2 min. 14 secs.). *Those Historic Years*. U. S. Recording, H9483.
- . "End of the War in Europe" (London, 8 May, 1945) (C). Gramophone, JOX 202.
- . "Five Years as Prime Minister" (13 May, 1945) (C). Gramophone, JOX 40/42.
- . "Iron Curtain Speech" (Fulton, Missouri, 5 March, 1946) (E: 1 min. 30 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881.
- . "Broadcast on Death of George VI" (7 February, 1952) (C). Columbia, C7900/1.
- . "Coronation Speech" (London, 2 June, 1953) (E: 2 min. 45 secs.). *Coronation Day*. Victor, LBC1063. Also (C). *The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II. Triumph*, 12001.
- . Fragments in *An Anthology of Rhetoric*. B & B Documentary Records, B&B4. Also in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *Ike From Abilene*. Abbey Records, W100. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753. Also in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1. Also in *The Quick and the Dead*. Victor, LM 1129.
- CLARK, CHAMP. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- CLEVELAND, GROVER. "Address to Democratic National Convention" (Chicago, Illinois, 1892) (E: 1 min.). *If I'm Elected*. Heritage, LP A1201.
- CLYNES, J. R. "General Election Speech" (1918) (C). His Master's Voice, D380.
- COBHAM, ALAN. "How to Fly an Aeroplane" (C). Columbia, 9161.
- COLERIDGE, STEPHEN. "Mercy to Animals" (1918) (C). His Master's Voice, D380.
- COOLIDGE, CALVIN. "Welcome to Lindbergh" (Washington, 11 June, 1927) (C). Victor, 35835. Also (C). *Cavalcade of Presidents*. Victor, PA103.
- . Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- CURLEY, JAMES MICHAEL. "A Tribute to Lincoln" (Washington, D.C., 4 May, 1923) (C). Mr. Boston. Linguaphone, XP47908.
- . "The Elk's Toast" (Boston, 1924) (C). Mr. Boston. Linguaphone, XP47911.
- . "The Forgotten Man" (Brooklyn, 1930) (C). Mr. Boston. Linguaphone, XP47907.
- . "Tribute to the Jewish People" (Washington, 1944) (C). Mr. Boston. Linguaphone, XP47909.
- . "Contributions of the Irish" (Boston) (C). Mr. Boston. Linguaphone, XP47910.
- . "Boston's Greetings" (Boston) (C). Mr. Boston. Linguaphone, XP47906.
- DALADIER, EDOUARD. Fragment in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- DEBS, EUGENE V. "Campaign Speech" (Chicago, 1912) (E: 30 secs.). *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- DE GAULLE, CHARLES. "Speech in London" (London, 8 July, 1940) (E: 55 secs.). *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- . Fragment in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800.
- DEWEY, JOHN. "Art as Our Heritage" (C). Your Child, Inc., Interstate Printers, #690.
- DEWEY THOMAS E. Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881. Also in *If I'm Elected*. Heritage, LP A1201. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- DIRKSEN, EVERETT. Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor LM1753.
- DODD, NORRIS E. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- DOYLE, SIR ARTHUR CONAN. "Conan Doyle Speaking" (1930) (C). His Master's Voice, C1983.
- EARHART, AMELIA. "Faith in the Air Age" (1931) (E: 2 min.). *Voices of Freedom*. Educational Services, ES1.
- EDEN, ANTHONY. Fragments in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1. Also in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- EDISON, THOMAS A. "Electrical Progress" (1908)

(C). *Voices of Freedom*. Educational Services, ES1.

FRANKLIN, D. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.

EDWARD J. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.

(C). *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.

Speech Master's Voice, D380.

Novem

1936

11 Dec

Can H

EINSTEIN, ALBERT. "Love, Hark the Years." (London) (C). His Master's Voice, D380.

RECORDS

tor, J

Dead

EISHER, HARRY. "Hark the Years." (London) (C). His Master's Voice, D380.

EL HU

U.N.

ELIZABETH II. "Triumph." (London) (C). His Master's Voice, D380.

Tow

Voic

cem

2056

1953

Triu

Jun

Day

Zea

ter

LB

I

ELIZA

Wo

(C)

EVAT

Tr

- (C). *Voices of Freedom*. Educational Services, ES1.
- . Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- EDWARD VIII. "Speech" (11 November, 1927) (C). His Master's Voice, RB2628.
- . "National Council of Social Service Speech" (London, 27 January, 1932) (C). His Master's Voice, RC2360-2.
- . "British Legion Festival Speech" (11 November, 1933) (C). Columbia, DX.
- . "Message to the Empire" (1 March, 1936) (C). His Master's Voice, RB8417.
- . "Abdication Speech" (Windsor Castle, 11 December, 1936) (E: 1 min. 10 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800.
- EINSTEIN, ALBERT. Fragments in *Conquest by Love*. Heritage Records, LP HG0050. Also in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282. Also in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- EISENHOWER, DWIGHT D. "Speech on D-Day" (London, 6 June, 1944) (C). *Those Historic Years*. Panacoustic, A-100.
- . Fragments in *Ike from Abilene*. Abbey Records, W-100. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753. Also in *The Quick and the Dead*. Victor, LM1129.
- EISHER, LESLIE H. Fragment in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- EL HUSSEIN, JEMAL. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- ELIZABETH II. "Speech to Children of Britain" (London, 13 October, 1940) (C). *Through Childhood to the Throne*. Victor, LM1770. Also (C). His Master's Voice, RB89111.
- . "Message on 21st Birthday" (Cape Town, 21 April, 1947) (C). His Master's Voice, RB8560.
- . "Christmas Message" (London, 25 December, 1952) (C). His Master's Voice, DA2056.
- . "Coronation Speech" (London, 2 June, 1953) (C). *Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II*. Triumph, 12001.
- . "Post-Coronation Speech" (London, 2 June, 1953) (E: 5 min. 45 secs.). *Coronation Day*. Victor, LBC1063.
- . "Christmas Message" (Auckland, New Zealand, 25 December, 1953) (C). His Master's Voice, DA2056.
- . Fragments in *Coronation Day*. Victor, LBC1063. Also in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800.
- ELIZABETH, QUEEN MOTHER. "Message to the Women of the Empire" (11 November, 1939) (C). His Master's Voice, RC138.
- EVATT, HERBERT. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- FAIRBANKS, DOUGLAS, SR. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- FIELDS, W. C. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- FOCH, FERDINAND. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- GANDHI, MAHATMA. "His Spiritual Message" (C). Columbia, C187M.
- . Fragments in *Conquest by Love*. Heritage Records, LP HG0050. Also in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- GEORGE V. "Welcome Speech and Opening of Tyne Bridge" (Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1928) (C). Columbia, 9414.
- . "Opening of Five-Power Naval Conference" (House of Lords, London, 21 January, 1930) (C). Victor, 22338. Also (C). His Master's Voice, RB3290.
- . "Opening of Indian Round-Table Conference" (London, 12 November, 1930) (C). Victor, 22596. Also (C). His Master's Voice, RB3669.
- . "Opening of World Monetary and Economic Conference" (12 June, 1933) (C). His Master's Voice, RB4468.
- . "Message to the Empire" (25 December, 1932) (C). His Master's Voice, RB84359.
- . "Message to the Empire" (25 December, 1933) (C). His Master's Voice, RB8101.
- . "Message to the Empire" (25 December, 1934) (C). His Master's Voice, RCS2717.
- . "Message to the Empire" (25 December, 1935) (C). His Master's Voice, RCS2811.
- . "Silver Jubilee Message to the Empire" (London, 6 May, 1935) (C). His Master's Voice, RC2747.
- . "Speech in Westminster Hall" (London, 9 May, 1935) (C). His Master's Voice, RC2748.
- GEORGE VI. "Message to the Empire" (London, 12 May, 1937) (C). His Master's Voice, RG15.
- . "Message to the Empire" (25 December, 1937) (C). His Master's Voice, RCS2982.
- . "Opening of the Empire Exhibition" (Glasgow, 3 May, 1938) (C). His Master's Voice, RC3007.
- . "The King to his Peoples" (3 September, 1939) (C). His Master's Voice, RB8969.
- . "Message to the Empire" (25 December, 1939) (C). His Master's Voice, RC3147.
- . "Message to the Empire" (1940) (C). His Master's Voice, RC3174.
- . "Message to the Empire" (23 September, 1940) (C). His Master's Voice, RC3189.
- . "Proclamation of Victory over Germany" (London, 8 May, 1945) (C). *Those Historic Years*. U. S. Recording, Hg483.
- . "Royal Silver Wedding Broadcast

- Speech" (26 April, 1948) (C). His Master's Voice, RB9654.
- . Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- GOEBBELS, JOSEPH PAUL. "Introduction of Hitler" (1934) (E: 45 secs.). *Hitler's Inferno*. Audio Rarities, 2445.
- GOEDHART, VAN HOEVEN. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- GOERING, HERMANN WILHELM. Fragment in *Hitler's Inferno*. Audio Rarities, 2445.
- GRENFELL, SIR WILFRED THOMASON. "Adrift on an Ice Floe" (1911) (C). His Master's Voice, D376.
- GROMYKO, ANDREI A. Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881. Also in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- GROSS, ERNEST A. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- HAAKON VII. Fragment in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800.
- HAMBRIDGE, GOVE. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- HARDING, WARREN GAMALIEL. "Address at Hoboken" (Hoboken, New Jersey, 23 May, 1921) (C). Victor, 35718. Also (C). *Cavalcade of Presidents*. Victor, PA101B.
- . "Address at Opening of International Conference for Limitation of Armaments" (Washington, 12 November, 1921) (E: 31 secs.). *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282. Also (E: 1 min. 13 secs.). *If I'm Elected*. Heritage, LP A1201. Also (C). Victor, 35718.
- HEFFLIN, THOMAS. Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- HERBERT, A. P. "Let's Be Gay" (London, 13 April, 1941) (C). His Master's Voice, B9178.
- HESS, RUDOLPH. Fragment in *Hitler's Inferno*. Audio Rarities, 2445.
- HILL, LISTER. Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- HITCHCOCK, RAYMOND. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- HITLER, ADOLF. "Talk in Rome" (Italy, May, 1938) (E: 30 secs.). *Hitler's Inferno*. Audio Rarities, 2445.
- . "Speech Against Eduard Benes" (Berlin, 26 September, 1938) (E: 50 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800.
- . Fragment in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- HOOVER, HERBERT. "War and Youth" (5 July, 1939) (E: 4 min.). *An Anthology of Rhetoric*. B & B Documentary Records, B&B4. Also (C). Victor, PA102B.
- . Fragments in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753. Also in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- HOPKINS, HARRY L. "Aid to Russia" (London, 27 July, 1941) (E: 40 secs.). *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- . Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- JACKSON, ROBERT. Fragment in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881.
- JOHNSON, AMY. "The Story of My Flight" (Sydney, Australia, 1930) (C). Columbia, DB182.
- JOHNSON, HUGH. Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- JULIANA, QUEEN OF THE NETHERLANDS. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- KALTENBORN, HANS VON. Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- KEFAUVER, ESTES. Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- KING, WILLIAM LYON MACKENZIE. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- KNOX, FRANK. Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- LA GUARDIA, FIORELLO H. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- LONDON, ALFRED E. Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *If I'm Elected*. Heritage, LP A1201. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- LANG, COSMO GORDON, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. "Tribute to the Memory of King George V" (26 January, 1936) (C). His Master's Voice, C2828-9.
- LEBRUN, ALBERT. Fragment in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- LEE OF FAREHAM, VISCOUNT. "The Navy Speech" (1909) (C). His Master's Voice, D382.
- LENIN, NIKOLAY. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- LEWIS, JOHN L. "A Plague on Both Your Houses" (Washington, 3 September, 1937) (E: 33 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800.
- . Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- LEWIS, SINCLAIR. Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- LIE, TRYGVE. "Election of U.N. Secretary General" (London, 2 February, 1946) (E: 38 secs.). *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- . Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- LILIENTHAL, DAVID E. "Credo of Democracy" (Washington, 4 February, 1947) (E: 1 min.

38 secs.
lumbia
LINDBERG
France
1927
S282.
I. Col
Victor
LLOYD C
(C). I
Septem
D384.
LUDGE,
of N
(E: 3
LONG,
Now
Presi
LONG,
(191
LUCE,
It N
MACA
Mis
46
A10
Bay
Yea
Ap
Col
Als
I.
de
McC
de
MAC
A
McL
(C
E
MA
U
MA
F
MA
b
s
M
M

- 38 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881.
- LINDBERGH, CHARLES AUGUSTUS. "Flight to France" (Navy Yard, Washington, 11 June, 1927) (E: 50 secs.). *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- , Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- LLOYD GEORGE, DAVID. "Budget Speech" (1909) (C). His Master's Voice, D381.
- , "The Empire's Honour" (London, 19 September, 1914) (C). His Master's Voice, D384.
- LODGE, HENRY CABOT. "Speech Against League of Nations" (Washington, November, 1918) (E: 35 secs.). *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- LONG, HUEY P. Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- LONG, VISCOUNT. "Termination of Hostilities" (1918) (C). His Master's Voice, D383.
- LUCE, CLARE BOOTHE. Fragment in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881.
- MACARTHUR, DOUGLAS. "Speech Aboard USS Missouri" (1 September, 1945) (E: 2 min. 46 secs.). *Those Historic Years*. Panacoustic, A100.
- , "Formal Japanese Surrender" (Tokyo Bay, 2 September, 1945) (C). *Those Historic Years*. U. S. Recording, Hg485.
- , "Speech to Congress" (Washington, 19 April, 1951) (C). Capitol, H274. Also (C). Columbia, ML4410. Also (C). Victor, LPM5. Also (C). Mercury, MGMCM.
- , Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- MCCARTHY, JOSEPH R. Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- MACDONALD, J. RAMSAY. "Robert Burns—a Man Amongst Men" (C). Columbia, 50222D.
- MCKINLEY, WILLIAM. "Campaign Address" (Canton, Ohio, 1896) (E: 62 secs.). *If I'm Elected*. Heritage, LP A1201.
- MAKIN, NORMAN. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- MANNERHEIM, C. G. Fragment in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- MARSHALL, GEORGE C. "Marshall Plan" (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 5 June, 1947) (E: 43 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881.
- , Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- MARTIN, JOSEPH W. Fragment in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800.
- MASARYK, JAN G. Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881. Also in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- MATHASIS. Fragment in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- MAUDE, CYRIL. "On Behalf of the Actors' Benevolent Fund" (1909) (C). His Master's Voice, D372.
- MEATH, EARL OF. "Empire Movement" (1910) (C). His Master's Voice, D836.
- , "Message to the Boys and Girls of the British Empire" (1910) (C). His Master's Voice, D837.
- MENON, KRISHNA. Fragment in *Conquest by Love*. Heritage Records, LP HG0050.
- MONTGOMERY, SIR BERNARD LAW. Fragment in *Ike from Abilene*. Abbey Records, W100.
- MUSSOLINI, BENITO. Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- MYRDAL, ALVA. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- NASH, WALTER B. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- NEHRU, JAWAHARLAL. Fragments in *Conquest by Love*. Heritage Records, LP HG0050. Also in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881.
- NIGHTINGALE, FLORENCE. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- NIXON, RICHARD M. "Explanation of Funds Speech" (Los Angeles, California, 23 September, 1952) (E: 32 secs.). *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- ORR, SIR JOHN BOYD. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- ORSBORN, ALBERT W. T. "I Was There" (C). Regal, MF316.
- PADEREWSKI, IGNACE JAN. Fragment in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- PALAR, L. M. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- PANKHURST, CHRISTABEL. "Suffrage for Women" (1909) (C). His Master's Voice, 01016.
- PEARSON, LESTER B. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- PEARY, ROBERT E. "Discovery of North Pole" (1909) (C). His Master's Voice, D377. Also (E: 3 min. 5 secs.). *Voices of Freedom*. Educational Services, ES1.
- PERSHING, JOHN J. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- PRETYMAN, E. G. "Navy Speech" (1908) (C). His Master's Voice, D382.
- PRIESTLEY, JOHN BOYNTON. "Women and the

- War" (22 September, 1940) (C). His Master's Voice, C3190.
- . Fragment in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- RAMASWAMI, SIR A. Fragment in *This is the U.N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- RAYBURN, SAM. Fragment in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800.
- REYNAUD, PAUL. "Plea for United States Aid" (Paris, 10 June, 1940) (E: 43 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800.
- . Fragment in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.
- RIBBENTROP, JOACHIM VON. Fragment in *Hitler's Inferno*. Audio Rarities, 2445.
- ROBERTS, G. H. "General Election Speech" (1918) (C). His Master's Voice, D383.
- ROBERTS, FREDERICK S. "National Service" (1913) (C). His Master's Voice, D367-8-9, Pts. I-VI.
- ROBINSON, CORRIE R. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- ROCKNE, KNUTE. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- ROGERS, WILL. "Speech on Politics" (New York, October, 1922) (E: 2 min. 35 secs.). *Voices of Freedom*. Educational Services, ES1.
- . "His Say of Politics" (1932) (C). *Voices of Freedom*. Educational Services, ES1.
- . Fragments in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282. Also in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *If I'm Elected*. Heritage, LP A1201.
- . Excerpts from various radio addresses in *Will Rogers Says*. Columbia, ML4604.
- ROMULO, CARLOS P. Fragment in *This is the U. N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- ROOSEVELT, ANNA ELEANOR. "Rebuke of Russians" (Paris, 1948) (E: 1 min.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881.
- . "United Nations Address" (Paris, December, 1948) (E: 48 secs.). *This is the U. N.* Tribune Productions, WA4853.
- . Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- ROOSEVELT, FRANKLIN DELANO. "First Inaugural Address" (1933) (C). *Voices of Freedom*. Educational Services, ES1. Also (E: 2 min. 10 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.
- . "On the Broader Definition of Liberty" (Washington, 30 September, 1934) (E: 3 min. 27 secs.). Victor, PA103A.
- . "Second Inaugural Address" (Washington, 20 January, 1937) (E: 40 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.
- . "Quarantine of Aggressive Nations" (Chicago, 5 October, 1937) (E: 33 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.
- . "Annual Message to Congress" (Washington, 3 January, 1940) (E: 44 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.
- . "Address at Jackson Day Dinner" (Washington, 8 January, 1940) (E: 1 min. 15 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.
- . "Appropriations for National Defense" (Washington, 16 May, 1940) (E: 55 secs.). *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- . "National Defense" (Washington, 16 May, 1940) (E: 62 secs.). *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- . "Commencement Address" (University of Virginia, 10 June, 1940) (E: 45 secs.). *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- . "Acceptance of Nomination" (Washington, 19 July, 1940) (E: 40 secs.). *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- . "Four Freedoms" (Washington, 6 January, 1941) (E: 1 min. 31 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.
- . "The Light of Democracy Must be Kept Burning" (Washington, 15 March, 1941) (E: 1 min. 9 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.
- . "Freedom of the Seas" (Washington, 11 September, 1941) (E: 1 min. 38 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.
- . "War Message" (Washington, 8 December, 1941) (C). Victor, V27734. Also (E: 7 min. 40 secs.). *An Anthology of Rhetoric*. B & B Documentary Records, B&B4. Also (E: 63 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628. Also (E: 60 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also (C). *Those Historic Years*. Panacoustic, H9478.
- . "Entrance of United States into the War" (Washington, 9 December, 1941) (E: 32 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628. Also (E: 44 secs.). *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- . "State of the Union Speech" (Washington, 6 January, 1942) (E: 1 min. 25 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.
- . "Report on the Home Front" (Washington, 12 October, 1942) (E: 33 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.
- . "State of the Union Speech" (Washington, 7 January, 1943) (E: 49 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.
- . "Address to White House Correspondents Association" (Washington, 12 February, 1943) (E: 42 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.
- . "State of the War" (Washington, 28 July, 1943) (E: 45 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.
- . "Prayer on D-Day" (Washington, 6

June, 1944) (E: 2 min. 20 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628. Also (C). *Those Historic Years*. Panacoustic, H9480.

— "Campaign Address" (Washington, 23 September, 1944) (E: 39 secs.). *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.

— "Summary of State of Union Message" (Washington, 6 January, 1945) (E: 35 secs.). *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628.

— "Message to Congress" (Washington, 1 March, 1945) (E: 35 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800.

— Fragments in *F. D. R. Speaks*. Decca, DL9628. Also in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282. Also in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881. Also in *If I'm Elected*. Heritage, LP A1201. Also in *Ike from Abilene*. Abbey Records, W100. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753. Also in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1. Also in *This is the U. N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.

ROOSEVELT, THEODORE. "Formation of Bull Moose Party" (Chicago, 7 August, 1912) (E: 33 secs.). *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.

— "American Principles of Life" (4 March, 1913) (E: 1 min. 30 secs.). *Voices of Freedom*. Educational Services, ES1.

RUSSELL, BERTRAND. "Human Nature and Politics" (Stockholm, 1950) (C). *Bertrand Russell Speaks*. Heritage, LP A1202.

RUTH, HERMAN ("BABE"). "Response to Tribute" (Yankee Stadium, New York, 27 April, 1947) (E: 45 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881.

— Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.

SCHUMANN-HEINK, ERNESTINE. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.

SHACKLETON, ERNEST. "Dash for the South Pole" (1909) (C). His Master's Voice, D377.

SHAH, MIAN JAFFAR. Fragment in *This is the U. N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.

SHARETT, MOSHE. "Israel Admitted to the U. N." (Flushing Meadows, New York, 11 May, 1949) (E: 32 secs.). *This is the U. N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.

SHAW, GEORGE BERNARD. "War" (1937) (C). *Bernard Shaw Speaks*. Heritage, LP Hoo74.

— Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.

SIKORSKY, IGOR I. Fragment in *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLPA1.

SMITH, ALFRED E. "Impressions of New York" (New York, 1928) (E: 29 secs.). *If I'm Elected*. Heritage, LP A1201.

— Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.

SMITH, ELLISON DURANT ("COTTON ED"). Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.

SOONG, T. V. Fragment in *This is the U. N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.

SPELLMAN, FRANCIS CARDINAL. "Prayers" (C). *Prayers and Poems*. Victor, M1097.

STALIN, JOSEPH. "Speech on Anniversary of Revolution" (Moscow, 7 November, 1941) (E: 46 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800.

STASSEN, HAROLD E. Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.

STEIN, GERTRUDE. Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.

STETTINIUS, EDWARD R. Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *This is the U. N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.

STEVENSON, ADLAI E. "Welcoming Speech" (Chicago, 21 July, 1952) (C). *Adlai E. Stevenson Speeches*. Triumph, 12002.

— "Acceptance of Nomination" (Chicago, 26 July, 1952) (C). *Adlai E. Stevenson Speeches*. Triumph, 12002. Also (E: 1 min. 58 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.

— "The Anatomy of Patriotism" (New York City, 27 August, 1952) (E: 1 min. 4 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.

— "Fun for a Change" (Denver, Colorado, 5 September, 1952) (E: 2 min. 8 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.

— "World Policy" (San Francisco, 9 September, 1952) (E: 5 min. 47 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769. Also (E: 36 secs.). *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.

— "On Political Morality" (Los Angeles, 11 September, 1952) (E: 4 min. 23 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.

— "The Atomic Future" (Hartford, Connecticut, 18 September, 1952) (E: 2 min. 58 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.

— "Labor Policy" (New York City, 22 September, 1952) (E: 31 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.

— "Korea" (Louisville, Kentucky, 27 September, 1952) (E: 40 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.

— "First Fireside Speech" (Chicago, Illinois, 29 September, 1952) (E: 2 min. 22 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.

— "The Area of Freedom" (Madison, Wisconsin, 8 October, 1952) (E: 3 min. 22 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.

— "The Proper Role of Government"

- (St. Louis, Missouri, 9 October, 1952) (E: 1 min. 34 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.
- . "On Liberty of Conscience" (Salt Lake City, 14 October, 1952) (E: 4 min. 50 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.
- . "Second Fireside Speech" (Los Angeles, 16 October, 1952) (E: 2 min. 34 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.
- . "Leadership for Peace" (New York City, 21 October, 1952) (E: 47 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.
- . "The Good Fight" (Chicago, 3 November, 1952) (E: 30 secs.). *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769.
- . "Report to the Nation" (Chicago, 15 September, 1953) (C). *Adlai E. Stevenson Speeches*. Triumph, 12002.
- . Fragments in *Adlai Stevenson Speaks*. Victor, LM1769. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- SUNDAY, WILLIAM ASHLEY (BILLY) Fragment in *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- TAFT, ROBERT A. Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- TAFT, WILLIAM HOWARD. "Rights of Labor" (1906) (E: 2 min.) *An Anthology of Rhetoric*. B & B Documentary Records, B&B4. Also (E: 40 secs.). *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282. Also (E: 2 min. 20 secs.) in *Voices of Freedom*. Educational Services, ES1.
- THOMAS, NORMAN M. Fragments in *If I'm Elected*. Heritage, LP A1201. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- THOMPSON, DOROTHY. "Let's Face the Facts" (July, 1940) (C). His Master's Voice, C3180.
- TORRES-BORDET, JAIME. Fragment in *This is the U. N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.
- TRUMAN, HARRY S. "Address in Congress" (Washington, 16 April, 1945) (E: 35 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800.
- . "Proclamation of Victory in Europe" (Washington, 8 May, 1945) (C). *Those Historic Years*. Panacoustic, H9482.
- . "V-J Day" (1 September, 1945) (E: 2 min.) *Those Historic Years*. Panacoustic, H9485.
- . "Electoral College Dinner Speech" (Washington, 19 January, 1949) (E: 1 min.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881.
- . "Speech after News of Election" (Washington, 19 January, 1949) (E: 45 secs.). *If I'm Elected*. Heritage, LP A1201.
- . "On American Freedom" (1950) (C). *Voices of Freedom*. Educational Services, ES1.
- . Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800. Also in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881. Also in *If I'm Elected*. Heritage, LP A1201. Also in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753. Also in *This is the U. N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.
- VISHINSKY, ANDREI Y. Fragments in *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881. Also in *This is the U. N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.
- WALLACE, HENRY AGARD. "Acceptance Speech" (Philadelphia, 24 July, 1948) (E: 42 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. II. Columbia, MM881.
- . Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- WEDGWOOD, JOSIAH. "Land and Labour" (1911) (C). His Master's Voice, D381.
- WEIZMAN, CHAIM. Fragment in *This is the U. N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.
- WILHELMINA, QUEEN OF THE NETHERLANDS. "Speech on the Invasion of Holland" (The Hague, 10 May, 1940) (E: 30 secs.). *Prelude to Pearl Harbor*. London Records, LLP1.
- WILLKIE, WENDELL L. "Acceptance of Nomination" (Elwood, Indiana, 17 August, 1940) (E: 48 secs.). *I Can Hear It Now*, Vol. I. Columbia, MM800.
- . "Election Eve Speech" (New York City, 4 November, 1940) (E: 3 min. 5 secs.). *If I'm Elected*. Heritage, LP A1201.
- . Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- WILKINSON, ELLEN B. Fragment in *This is the U. N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.
- WILSON, WOODROW. "Speech to Indians" (Washington, 1912) (E: 32 secs.). *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- . "U. S. Relations with Indians" (1915) (E: 1 min. 40 secs.). *Voices of Freedom*. Educational Services, ES1.
- . "On the League of Nations" (Washington, 10 November, 1923) (E: 31 secs.). *Hark the Years*. Capitol, S282.
- WINANT, JOHN G. Fragment in *This is the U. N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.
- WISE, STEPHEN S. "Prayers" (C). *Prayers and Songs for the Sabbath*. Victor, MO1192.
- WOOLLCOTT, ALEXANDER. Fragment in *Mr. President*. Victor, LM1753.
- ZULETO, EDUARDO. Fragment in *This is the U. N. Tribune Productions*, WA4853.

TEACHING SPEECH IN A LIBERAL ARTS PROGRAM FOR YOUNG EXECUTIVES

Victor M. Powell

"Management in Search of Men,"¹ the title of a recent magazine article, underscores the intense efforts of business organizations to find and train men for executive positions. Each year the courses designed to train management personnel for business multiply, and popular periodicals abound in reports of these programs.² Many of them are designed to deal specifically with business problems, but the protagonist of the liberal arts need not search far to find support for the proposition that training in the liberal arts is the best preparation for the would-be executive. David A. Shepard, a Director of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, reports his company's increasing interest in non-technically trained men, and quotes Irving S. Olds, retired Chairman of the Board of U. S. Steel, as saying, "The most difficult problems American enterprise faces today are neither scientific nor technical, but lie chiefly in the realm of what is embraced in a liberal arts education."³

The author of this essay on teaching speech to overgraduates (to use a term not yet in Webster) is an Associate Professor of Speech at Wabash College. He took his undergraduate degree at the University of Minnesota, his master's and doctorate at the University of Missouri.

¹ By David A. Shepard in *The Atlantic Monthly*, CXCVII, 3 (March, 1956), 65-68.

² For instance, in addition to the Shepard article, see William H. Whyte Jr., "Sabbatical for Businessmen?" *Fortune*, LIII, 6 (June, 1956), 148-150; 244; 247-248; E. Digby Baltzell, "Bell Telephone's Experiment in Education," *Harper's Magazine*, CCX, 1258 (March, 1955), 73-77; and "Back to School for Executives," *The Library Journal*, LXXX (1 November, 1955), 2431-2432.

³ Shepard, *op. cit.*, 66.

For the past two years I have served on the faculty planning committee and have taught the speech part of a liberal arts program for training young executives. The program, initiated at Wabash College in the summer of 1955 under a grant from the Kellogg Foundation, seeks to give potential business leaders an introduction to the disciplines of the liberal arts. The participants come primarily from manufacturing companies, though banking, finance, brokerage, and retail sales are also represented. Their educational background is varied. Classes have included men with no college experience and one man with a doctorate in chemical engineering. The majority of those holding college degrees are technically trained—chemical, industrial, and electrical engineers. In age the men have ranged from twenty-one to forty-five years. The average age of the first class was thirty-two years, of the second class, thirty-five years. Though participants represented a wide range in business experience, education, and age, they had this in common: each had been designated by his company as a man of unusual promise. I shall refer to these men as "students," but you should remember that the word refers to mature men, some with as much as twenty years' business experience.

During their stay on campus these executive-students receive an intensive course of lectures and readings in the physical and social sciences and in the humanities. Lecture topics suggest the scope of the program. On one day the men heard lectures on "Economics and

the Future" and "Frontier of Science." The next morning's lecture topics were "Religion in the Twentieth Century" and "Why Read a Book?" Readings included Sophocles' *Antigone*, Plato's *Apology*, *Candide*, *Hamlet*, and selections from Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* and Samuel Lubell's *The Future of American Politics*.

The day's schedule begins at nine with two lecture sessions, each an hour and fifteen minutes in length. The afternoon is kept free for study and for individual counselling with our staff psychologist and with representatives from a firm specializing as psychological consultants to management. The evening sessions are devoted to the seminar discussion of assigned readings.

Over a period of five years the students spend ten weeks on the Wabash campus during the summer months when college is not in session. The campus residence is distributed over the five years in the following manner: three weeks the first summer, two weeks in each of the next three summers, and one week in the final summer. In addition to the time they spend on campus, the college arranges for a continuing relationship with the men during the rest of the year when they are on the job. This is accomplished by visits from the staff psychologist and by two meetings (in the late fall and early spring) of the entire group, which some of the staff members attend.

The planning committee early agreed that speech training should have an important place in the program. Yet because of the heavy demands on the students' time, the training had to be accomplished within severe time restrictions, both for the instructor's lectures and individual criticisms and for the students' speech preparation.

The committee assigned to speech instruction four of the thirty-three lecture

sessions available in the opening three weeks. On the first day, both lecture sessions were concerned with speech. We so utilized the time in order to prepare the students as quickly as possible for their own speech-making, which began on the second day. The first lecture, delivered by Professor W. N. Brigance, dealt with the problems, opportunities, and responsibilities of communication in a free society. In the second period I began the specific instruction in speech-making with a lecture on the fundamentals of delivery and an introduction to speech organization. The third lecture, given at the conclusion of the first week, dealt with speech composition; and the final lecture, given the last week of the course, introduced the students to the principles of group discussion. At the beginning of each lecture the student received an outline of that lecture. The outlines served two purposes: Since we used no textbook, the outlines became a permanent reference for the student, and the careful preparation of the outlines enabled them to serve as examples of speech organization and outlining.

Since the schedule could allow no time for speech-making in regular class sessions, we decided to use the dinner sessions for student speeches. Each evening, while the group remained at the tables, four students spoke. With the use of a limited number of luncheons for the same purpose, all students made three five-minute speeches during the three weeks. We gained still further opportunities for students to address the group by assigning one student each day to act as program chairman for the day and another student to act as reporter. The reporter's task required him to report each day at noon a summary of the preceding day's activity. Thus in three weeks each student spoke before the group at least five times.

To keep the burden of speech preparation as light as possible, we urged students to draw upon their business experience, hobbies, or community work for speech subjects. I confess this subject matter had one disadvantage: most students talked about their job experience, and a series of speeches by unskilled speakers describing industrial processes is likely to be dull. On the other hand, these speeches provided excellent material for warning the speakers against the use of jargon and specialists' vocabularies. The students themselves soon felt the limitations of the subject matter and many quickly extended themselves to find topics of more general interest.

With the lectures and speech-making provided for, we still faced the problem of finding time for individual criticism and counselling. We could not make critiques at the conclusion of the dinner speaking for fear of encroaching upon the evening seminar period. This problem we solved by the intensive use of tape recordings. We recorded every speech during its delivery. The student then made an appointment with me for the next afternoon to hear the playback and hear my comments on the speech. When necessary, these periods also provided the opportunity for individual drill work. From the tape recordings, I could comment on organization, language, and use of the voice. I had made written notes on the visual aspects of delivery while the student was speaking, and I covered these as well in the individual conferences.

No speech teacher will be surprised to learn that the major delivery problem of most students was use of the voice: dull voices lacking adequate volume and inflection. I found one device helpful in quickly pointing up this problem and getting the speaker started on correct-

ing it. I stopped the playback after a particularly dull, lifeless sentence and wrote that sentence on the blackboard. For the next few minutes the student would drill on that sentence. When he achieved something approaching adequate volume and inflection, I would have him repeat the sentence again and record it on the tape, immediately following its appearance in the speech as originally made. When the two sentences were played back the student was invariably impressed by the contrast and had a vivid demonstration of the direction in which he had to go.

We made one further use of the tape recorder. Though students were encouraged to make appointments for help in preparation before speaking, these conferences were of necessity short. However, we placed another tape recorder in a separate room where students could use it to rehearse speeches while others were listening to playbacks of speeches they had previously made.

In the first two summers of this course we have not been able to do much with training in group discussion, though we have made a start. In addition to the lecture on principles of discussion and participation in evening seminars, in each session we have assigned several students the task of organizing and leading an evening seminar. On the basis of experience thus far we plan to make more use of the student-led discussions in future sessions.

What can be accomplished in this kind of program to improve effectiveness in speaking has encouraged me. Though my own judgment may be prejudiced by my personal involvement, I have had the testimony of other staff members who have heard all or most of the student speeches. They agree that the students make marked improvement in the course of three weeks.

TELEVISED FORENSICS

Wayne E. Brockriede and David B. Strother

RECENT experimental evidence suggests that "televised education" can effectively bring the classroom into the living room.¹ Unfortunately, little is known about television's potential effectiveness in some educational areas, for example, forensics.² In essence, can televised forensics achieve educational values for student participants and their audiences?

If the primary strength of a high school or college forensics program is training students to become effective leaders in the deliberation of public affairs, they must have opportunities to speak in realistic audience situations. Television serves as an important sup-

Forensics is probably the most anciently honorable of extracurricular activities in American schools: it held a secure position for generations before dramatics achieved respectability. So far there is no newer activity than television. Yet once again we see that old and new can ally in a union that strengthens both.

The senior author (who took his baccalaureate and master's degrees at Indiana State Teachers College and his doctorate at the University of Illinois) is an Assistant Professor of Speech and Supervisor of Forensics at the University of Illinois. The junior author (whom Georgetown College granted the A.B. and Northwestern the M.A.) is an Assistant Professor of Speech and Director of Forensics at the University of Georgia, currently on leave.

¹ In its "Fact Sheets" the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, 14 Gregory Hall, Urbana, Illinois, publishes abstracts of experimental studies of the effectiveness of television in education. The cost of a year's subscription to the "Fact Sheets" is \$2.50.

² For a review of thirty-five commercial network programs with discussion format, see Robert Haakenson, "Adapting Debate to Television," *Western Speech*, XVII (May, 1953), 165-173. However, there seem to be few reports of educationally-sponsored forensics telecasts. Among them are "The First Television Debate," *The Speaker*, XXIV (May, 1947), 3; and Edward Stasheff and N. Edd Miller, "Televising a Debate in a Courtroom Setting," *The Speech Teacher*, III (September, 1954), 215-219.

plementary means of achieving this objective and, in addition, introduces students to a challenging new medium of mass communication—one which requires visual adaptation.

The audience can also profit from televised forensics because forensics and democracy are concerned with the same problems, materials, and processes. So the high school or college forensics program has an opportunity to serve the local public by stimulating greater interest in public issues and vividly illustrating rational methods of deliberation in a democratic society.

The purpose, then, of this article is to share with you some of our operational problems as we tried to achieve these educational values in a series of twelve forensics programs, "Youth Faces the Issues," over the University of Illinois station, WILL-TV, from February to May, 1956.

THE INSTRUMENT OF DELIBERATION

"Every educational telecasting operation must have some overall purpose or 'idea' on which it bases its programming," writes William K. Cumming, Director of Television Development, Stephens College.³ Our first consideration was to choose a basic "idea," or instrument, which represented the methods used in the deliberation of public questions, and to adapt it to television.

Should televised forensics programs be based upon discussion, debate, or a complementary relationship of the two? A growing number of recent writers are

³ This is *Educational Television* (Ann Arbor: Edward Brothers, Inc., 1954), p. 151.

discarding the notion that these activities are antithetical and mutually exclusive. As early as 1939, Lester Thonssen called discussion and debate "two aspects of one process" which "play complementary roles in the broader functions of persuasion."⁴ More recently, Halbert E. Gulley has defined his "deliberation continuum" as a "continuous progression of closely related steps," from inquiry to advocacy.⁵ Clearly, the deliberative process unifies discussion and debate, and we believe that on questions of public policy both are almost inevitable. Discussion explores the complex issues of a public question, resolves some into agreement, and crystallizes others into disagreement, of which debate is the natural result.

We may have performed a useful educational function for the students who participated and for the audience by placing discussion and debate in one framework, thereby dramatizing the unity of the deliberative process. Our procedure was simple. We devoted two telecasts to a current public problem. On the first, four panelists defined terms, explored historical background, analyzed cause-effect relationships, formulated goals, and considered possible solutions. On the second, two panelists returned to engage in a cross-examination debate on some issue which had emerged in the previous discussion. The conflict usually centered around possible solutions. For example, one of the questions discussed was "How can the United States implement racial desegregation in the public schools?" In the course of the discussion, controversy arose around one panelist's opinion that "The Supreme Court should strictly en-

force desegregation in the public schools," which became the proposition for the cross-examination debate.

So much for procedure. Now, how did we adapt it to television without harmfully affecting the exploration of crucial issues? Obviously, natural deliberation of public problems requires an inestimable amount of time for reading, analysis, and assimilation. It is not customary to discuss important public problems for thirty minutes one week and to debate for thirty minutes the next. Even when we had selected questions appropriate to the interests and points of view of the panelists and on which public deliberation had determined many of the possible issues, we still needed a catalyst to speed up the process.

The catalyst consisted of group meetings before presentation of the program. After an informal conference with each panelist, the moderator selected facets of the question, placed them in outline form, and distributed a copy to each panelist. The first group meeting consisted of a thirty-minute discussion of the topic on radio, five hours before the telecast. Following this program, the moderator met informally with the panel to discuss matters which they had added, emphasized, omitted, or slighted. The panelists by this time generally had some idea of how far the pattern of reflective thinking would go before it gave way to debate, and the moderator was ready to select the principal disputants and suggest to them when the main conflicting ideas should reach a climax. In every instance we advised the panelists that they were in no way committed to follow the outline. Although this freedom complicated the moderator's duties, it assured the discussants' spontaneity.

⁴ "The Social Values of Discussion and Debate," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXV (February, 1939), 117.

⁵ *Essentials of Discussion and Debate* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1955), p. 3.

INTEREST FACTORS

After selecting the deliberative process as our instrument, we faced the problem of choosing interest factors, for, as Tom Battin, Television Production Manager at the University of Houston, has written, "If an educational program is interesting, it will hold attention."⁶ We rejected two extreme points of view: (1) the notion of placing primary emphasis on showmanship to the neglect of educational objectives; and (2) the contention that educational television should have no special concern with interest appeals. The latter position denies a basic assumption underlying rhetoric, public address, discussion, and debate which James A. Winans appropriately summarized when he wrote that the speaker's first task is to win "fair, favorable, or undivided attention to propositions."⁷

We agree with the position of LeRoy Bannerman, of the University of Alabama Radio and Television Broadcasting Service, who has stated, "To be highly entertained is not necessarily to be subjected to an educationally deficient project . . . but it merely means that the particular audience has found the project compelling."⁸ How, then, could we make televised forensics a compelling project while retaining primary emphasis upon its educational objectives? We considered such interest factors as (1) skill and training of participants, (2) continuity and frequency of presentation, and (3) variety of personnel and formats. As we consider these items, you will observe the dependence each has on the other.

First, an interesting program must

⁶ "The Implications of Television in Education," *The Southern Speech Journal*, XVIII (May, 1953), 243.

⁷ *Public Speaking* (Rev. ed.; New York: The Century Company, 1924), p. 193.

⁸ "Entertain to Educate," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, VLII (April, 1956), 170.

have skilled participants. Naturally, our first consideration was to select from the membership of the Illini Forensic Association students who had extensive experience in intercollegiate discussion and debate, but who still needed training in adapting to television. Our initial method was to provide experience in radio discussion which we hoped would transfer to television. We provided this experience with the co-operation of the Illini Student Forum, a student discussion program series which has been presented weekly for the past eight years over radio station WILL. Many of our prospective panelists had appeared frequently on this program, and we assigned others to it for similar experience. The other training method provided a more immediate and specific value by enabling the panelists to initiate their ideas in a related medium. Although we definitely did not regard the radio program as a mere rehearsal for the televised discussion, we believe it permitted the moderator and discussants to bring into better focus the relative importance of various issues, to learn what information and opinions the other panelists had, and to acquire an assimilated understanding of the question.

Second, we believe that a regular continuity of programming and format increases the interest value for the audience. We accomplish this continuity, in part, by selecting as our basic format a discussion-debate unit consisting of two thirty-minute periods with seven days elapsing between presentations. The delay was not an ideal arrangement, but it expeditiously enabled the advocates to prepare and polish their constructive presentations for the debate which was to follow. Presenting programs on a weekly basis was also consistent with the number of participants who were qualified and available to us and the

ally, amount of time the station allotted. Although we found the weekly program highly desirable, a more or less frequent schedule could be arranged, or perhaps forensics programs might be inserted regularly into another series already established.

Too much regularity, however, may cause interest to lag. We tried to avoid this lag through a third interest factor, variety of personnel and types of programs. In the case of "Youth Faces the Issues," we selected eight students whose experience qualified them and formed two permanent panels of four members each which alternated throughout the series. When a regular member was unable to participate, we obtained a substitute from a short list of alternates. The resulting stability aided planning, and yet we presented occasional new faces to the television audience. In addition to presenting new faces, we also varied program formats to provide diversified forensic experiences for the participants and the audience. After each series of two discussion-debates (or four programs), we introduced a "special": a parliamentary debate, and a presentation of the three winners in the Alfred D. Huston Memorial Awards in Public Speaking. The parliamentary debate was our most ambitious undertaking.⁹ For this debate, we secured a studio audience of about twenty-five students in the beginning public speaking class and intercollegiate debaters. The house was divided: those for the resolution sat on one side, those opposed on the other, and we encouraged them to move to the other side when their convictions changed. The chairman called the meeting to order and explained the procedure briefly. A motion to adopt the resolution, "That the health of the

President should be an issue in the 1956 campaign," was made and seconded. Debaters from the University of Illinois and Michigan State University, on a split-team basis, presented five-minute principal speeches, after which debate was opened to the house. Almost everyone spoke at least once. Several minutes before the end of the allotted time (which for this program was increased to sixty minutes) a motion to end debate was made and passed, a vote on the resolution was taken, the result announced, and the meeting adjourned. The format for the second "special" was simple. After a short introduction by the chairman, each student spoke for eight or nine minutes. We encouraged the speakers to use visual aids, which a second camera picked up.

The parliamentary debate, in particular, has strong potential interest appeal because of such features as the divided house, the movement of the audience, the variety of speakers, interruptions, harassments, and the like. But neither the parliamentary debate nor the presentation of award-winning speakers exhausts the possibilities of special types of televised forensics. The University of Michigan and Western Reserve University have experimented with the courtroom style of debating.¹⁰ Robert Haakenson reports that Lawrence Spivak, producer of "Meet the Press," is interested in the possibilities of adapting orthodox intercollegiate debate to television.¹¹ Other types of programs which directors of forensics should consider for television broadcast are the direct clash debate and the presentation of readings on a current topic from critical journals most audiences have not read. Resourceful directors of

⁹ For a brief description of the face-to-face parliamentary debate, see Gulley, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-92.

¹⁰ Stasheff and Miller, *op. cit.*; letter from Warren Guthrie, 30 August, 1956.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, 172.

forensics have a variety of formats from which to choose.

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Facilities for the entire program series were quite modest. For discussions and debates we used rectangular tables. We realize that semi-circular, V-shaped, or perhaps even circular table arrangements might increase group cohesiveness and camera effectiveness for the discussions, but we were using easily accessible facilities. We used a large rectangular table for the discussions when the program necessitated four panelists and a moderator. During the cross-examination debate the following week we used a smaller table for the two advocates and the moderator. With the exception of the size of the tables, floor arrangements for the discussions and debates were identical.

The studio crew used three cameras for the parliamentary debate, although only two were necessary for all other programs. We used unidirectional table microphones for the deliberation process. In the "specials," however, only the moderator had a table microphone, and other participants used boom microphones which, of course, were not visible on the television screen.

JUDGING EFFECTIVENESS

One method of determining the effects of "Youth Faces the Issues" is to determine whether or not we achieved our two objectives for televised forensics: to train students in the deliberation of public affairs and to serve the local public by stimulating interest in public issues. We can only estimate subjectively that the students who participated gained a better understanding of the relationship between inquiry and advocacy. Gauging audience reaction was even more difficult because we

lacked adequate tools of measuring, not listenability, but learning. The only means available to us were the reception of phone calls during each program and the subsequent comments of students and faculty members.

Another method of judging the effectiveness of a program series is through listener polls which seek to determine the popularity of a given program. While the listener poll is useful in commercial television, we were interested not so much in the number of viewers as in reaching the minority whose preference favored our project. Compared to those of commercial television programs, our audience was small, perhaps five per cent, perhaps one per cent, of the number of sets in our reception area. So small an audience would be discouraging if we were selling toothpaste, but our aim was to extend forensics, and our viewing audience may well have been larger than any audience ever to view a local forensics event in the face-to-face situation.

CO-OPERATION WITH THE STATION

Naturally, the first problem of liaison with the television station is to gain acceptance of the idea of televised forensics. In educational television this is a relatively easy procedure because their objectives and ours are similar. The opportunity is fairly good even in commercial television as indicated by a survey conducted by Edgar G. Will, Jr., who reports that colleges and universities pointed out that twenty-four commercial stations had responded enthusiastically to university-produced programs, fifteen were rated as "warm," five as "barely cooperative," and one as "non-cooperative."¹²

¹² "Trends of University Participation in Television Activity," *The Southern Speech Journal*, IXX (September, 1953), 27.

There are several reasons for the attitude of the majority of stations in this sample. First, forensics programs are relatively inexpensive, easy to produce, and require only limited facilities. For example, rehearsal costs are eliminated, a curtain backdrop is the only scenery necessary, and tables and chairs are the only essential properties. A second reason is implied in the Federal Communications Commission Act of 1934 which declared that all stations must air public service programs in the "Public interest, convenience, or necessity." Since the FCC has the option of suspending or renewing a station's license every three years, commercial stations are usually eager to find good programs of this type.¹³

But well-conceived programs are not necessarily well-produced ones. Once you have won acceptance for a forensics series, success will depend considerably upon the willingness of the station producer and yourself to work co-operatively. The station producer knows more about his facilities and production problems than you do, and you know more about discussion, debate, and public speaking than he does. A mutual

¹³ For a discussion of these reasons, see Haakenson, *op. cit.*, 165-166.

sharing of experiences and abilities should provide maximum effectiveness for the series.

We have presented some of the major operational problems in sponsoring "Youth Faces the Issues." In an amateur production, moderated by an amateur who presided over amateur panelists, there were other difficulties we have not mentioned: co-ordination with other forensic activities, last-minute substitutions of panelists, timing, and the like. These frustrations, however, are characteristic of such activities.

We emerged from our experience convinced that through this medium forensics directors can render a service to the student and the community. Consequently, we are continuing the series with the same basic format, but with a greater variety of "specials."

As developments of science bring about a new technological era, social change is inevitable, and deliberation on problems created by social change is a function of forensic activity. The student of forensics should be trained now to use all media of communication in full view of the community that both may be better equipped to play their roles in this new era.

EXCURSUS

4. Transitions. It is very important that the student in vocal culture be able to take any pitch at will, making sudden transitions. Who has not suffered agonies untold, when listening to a speaker whose voice was keyed upon and sustained, without variableness or shadow of turning, upon the highest and sharpest pitch possible? The minister who preaches upon an even pitch, whether high or low, lulls his audience to sleep. The high voice is at first offensive to the ear, but bye and bye the sameness is found to be a fatal opiate. Nothing rests the voice like transitions of pitch, time, force and quality.—Anna T. Randall, *Reading and Elocution: Theoretical and Practical* (New York: Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Co., 1869), pp. 26-27.

MEETING SPECIFIC SPEECH NEEDS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: THE SPEECH PROGRAM IN A TEACHERS COLLEGE

Ellen Kauffman

THOSE of us who are on the speech faculties of teachers colleges want to prepare our students to serve well in public schools and communities, and to be "missionaries" awakening in the public an interest in speech education. If our programs are effective, we are in all probability directing them toward meeting specific speech needs in the public schools. To help us gauge our effectiveness, it seems to me, we must learn the answers to these questions: (1) What is our speech department doing to help determine the specific needs in speech in the public schools? (2) In communities in which we have made surveys, what are the basic needs for speech education? (3) How is our department helping and motivating the public schools to meet these needs? (4) In the light of our findings, what should State Departments of Public Instruction and teachers colleges do to build more effective programs?

At the Montclair [New Jersey] State Teachers College our department of speech has been helping to determine the speech needs in the public schools in four ways: through well-planned and

well-conducted surveys, through a questionnaire to teachers and principals through the speech laboratory service we offer on campus, and through the speech interview we conduct with each applicant for admission to the freshman class.

I

At this writing, we have completed six surveys in public schools. The earliest was in May, 1952, the latest in January, 1956. In one instance, a guidance director and two directors of elementary education were initiators of the survey; in another, a regular classroom teacher with training in speech, her principal, curriculum director, and superintendent requested the survey; in two instances the principal of a small school system enlisted our co-operation; in two other cases the school psychologist was the person who felt the need of our survey. All of these met with us and worked with us closely, outlining the direction the surveys could take, what questions we might expect them to answer, how we could so conduct them as to be of value to the school, without upsetting regular programs in either the public school or the college.

No remuneration figured in the planning, conducting, and reporting of the surveys. The school districts, however, met the costs of mimeographed materials, lunches, and transportation. In order to avoid any possible confusion, we set down explicitly the items on

If there is a cynical reader of *The Speech Teacher*, he may speculate on whether or not the author of this essay is as versatile in knowledge and skill as she recommends the teacher of speech be. One of her intermittent colleagues can testify that she is indeed.

Miss Kauffman is Assistant Professor in Speech Sciences at Montclair [New Jersey] State Teachers College. During summer sessions she is frequently an important member of the staff of the Speech Laboratory at Teachers College, Columbia University, which school awarded her her master's degree.

which we agreed as a result of our planning:

1. We set the day(s) on which we would make the survey, specifying the hours of beginning and ending.
2. Junior and senior students of the college who had advanced theory and practicum in speech and whom we had briefed well were to make the survey, under the direction of the speech faculty.
3. These students were to visit different classrooms to hear each child speak or speak and read.
4. The school district was to supply the mimeographed questionnaire forms for the classroom teachers, the check sheets for the surveyors, and the reading material for the older pupils.
5. The administrator in charge of the school district was to inform the entire personnel of the district of our plans, and how they might help us carry them out with the minimum possible interference with classroom routine. He was to instruct the classroom teachers to list on the check sheets the biographical material requested, to announce the approximate time of the surveyor's arrival at the classroom, and to request the classroom teacher to make no prior preparation for the visit.
6. After completion of the survey, the students were to summarize their findings concerning the pupils they had heard, and at a meeting in the district called for that purpose a faculty member was to report and interpret the findings of the survey.

The findings of these surveys, we hoped, would supply answers to the following questions: (1) What are the characteristics of pupils' voice and speech habits in speaking or speaking and reading situations in the classroom? (2) According to the surveyors, what are the needs for speech improvement and re-education in these school systems? (3) In how many and what kinds of speech activities do pupils participate in their classrooms and elsewhere? (4) How much and what kind of training in speech and dramatics do the in-service teachers have? (5) What kinds of program would best meet the needs in these school systems?

We supplied each surveyor with the following instructions:

1. Tell the teacher and the class who you are, and where you are from. Explain briefly to the pupils what you would like them to do and say while you are in the classroom.
2. Establish rapport.
3. Obtain the check sheets (which the teacher should already have arranged in alphabetical order).
4. Sit in the back of the room or in some other location so that the pupils will have the entire class as an audience. (Do not conduct a private interview.)
5. Allow approximately two minutes for each pupil tested.
6. From kindergarten through the fourth grade, after each student has taken his position in front of the group, ask him to tell about himself and his interests. For example, ask him to tell his name and his age, to count from one to ten, to recite a rhyme, to tell about his favorite television show, to tell about his favorite game, to describe a pet, or to talk about what he would like to be when he grows up. (Note: You may want to set up a situation that will call for the information in the form of television interviewing, or the like.)
7. Be sure to have each pupil talk enough for you to determine his (a) voice production or phonation, (b) rhythm pattern, (c) articulation pattern. Be sure to have him use all sounds.
8. In grades five through twelve, allow no more than two minutes for listening to each pupil. Should the child have difficulty with the reading, make some encouraging remark even though he has lacked time to finish.
9. Be sure to observe all varieties of lisp.
10. Be observant, too, of evidence of physical or structural handicaps or problems. Note evidences of cerebral palsy, of cleft-palate speech, of poor occlusion, of hearing loss, and of language impairment. Note seeming maladjustments and evidence of lack of poise and ease.
11. Rate each student according to the following scale:
 - (a) *Adequate*: No noticeable errors; uses acceptable patterns; (b) *Improvement Needed*: Include here the "garden

variety" of speech faults, such as weak or fading volume, dull patterns of articulation, and poor phrasing in reading or in speaking; (c) *Remedial Work*: Evident faults in speaking patterns; needs re-training; voice and speech habits interfere with communication. Include record of all noticeable lisps.

12. Before leaving the room, try to confer briefly with the teacher about the students you think need remedial training in speech. Get her opinions.
13. Be sure to sign each check sheet and to bring the sheets with you.
14. Before leaving the room, be sure to express to all your appreciation of their co-operation.
15. Use a separate summary sheet to record your findings for each group tested.

While the college student was in the classroom, several tape recordings of his testing were made. Members of the speech faculty and of the administrative staff of the school district observed him in action.

The schools we observed included those in a county system (the even-numbered grades from the second through the twelfth, and three kindergartens); two schools in rural and small town residential centers (in one, we tested all children from kindergarten through the eighth grade; in the other, all children from kindergarten through the twelfth grade); two small-town school systems, housed in a single building (in one instance, we tested all children from kindergarten through the sixth grade; in the other, all children from kindergarten through the eighth grade); and a metropolitan school system (all children in special classes and from kindergarten through the sixth grade). In summary, we surveyed one large county system, two smaller rural systems, two small-town systems, and one metropolitan school.

In these six surveys we tested the speech of 9,538 children. Of that number, according to the surveyors, 1,897

needed remedial work; 4,863 needed work in speech improvement; and 2,780 pupils had adequate or satisfactory speech. The kinds of problems and the numbers of children needing remedial speech or speech improvement work for them were rhythm problems, 552; articulation problems, 3,236; phonation problems, 3,950; and all other problems 1,655.

According to our observations, there were in these six school systems few children with severe speech disorders or with difficulties apparently of pathological origin. For example, among the 3,257 children observed in the metropolitan system, there were only three with cerebral palsy, one who had had poliomyelitis, and none with cleft-palate speech. We also found that only a small number of the children we observed had severe stutters.

The most frequent speech problem requiring therapy seems to be the lisp. This fault was prevalent at all grade levels. In the metropolitan school system, 267 pupils had a faulty [s]. The most prevalent phonatory difficulties were chronic hoarseness, stridency, nasality and denasality, breathiness, and insufficient volume. These problems were also common to all grade levels.

We found that most of the children did not read aloud well. They had difficulty in general in communicating thought, and in grouping for meaning in particular. They made many strong-weak form errors.

Approximately fifty per cent of the children seemed to need knowledge of and practice in using the fundamentals of effective voice and speech patterns. An average of nearly twenty per cent of all the children heard needed some sort of remedial work. (This estimate includes children with non-native patterns of stress and intonation.)

On the
to the
schools v
dent to
the nam
naire in
swers to
the last

1. What
had i
2. What
had i
craft,
3. What
have
4. What
etc.)
room
5. In y
in sp

A t
school
those
course
268 w
There
been
five, t
two i
"all
taken
speec
speec
tation
dren
matic
deba
In
tion,
class
ities
ienc
thes
dran
ing,
citi
ipar
exe

II

On the questionnaire we distributed to the principals and teachers of the schools we surveyed we asked the respondent to state his name, his position, and the name of the school. The questionnaire included five questions, the answers to all of which (except perhaps the last one) could be quite brief:

1. What specific course or courses have you had in speech? (Briefly describe.)
2. What specific course or courses have you had in dramatics? (Include acting, stagecraft, directing, etc.)
3. What speech experiences do your students have in your classes?
4. What speech experiences (assemblies, plays, etc.) do students have outside the classroom?
5. In your opinion, what are the greatest needs in speech education in your school?

A total of 354 teachers in the six schools returned the questionnaire. Of those 354, 268 had had at least one course in speech. A majority of these 268 were in the metropolitan system. There were only five teachers who had been trained to teach speech. Of these five, two had majored in general speech, two in speech correction, and one in "all areas." The courses teachers had taken included fundamentals of speech, speech correction and improvement, speech in the classroom, oral interpretation, teaching the handicapped, children's literature and storytelling, dramatics, acting, radio, public speaking, debating, and elocution.

In their answers to our second question, the teachers indicated that their classrooms afford a wealth of opportunities for speaking activities and experiences. In order of frequency of listing, these include discussion, "show-tell," dramatization, oral reports, oral reading, telling and re-creating stories, reciting poetry, choral speaking, participation in clubs, conducting opening exercises, using the tape recorder, cre-

ative dramatics, conversation, class planning, word games, singing, carrying messages to other classrooms and to the office, "question-answer" quizzes, oral spelling, and tongue-lip exercises.

Outside the classroom, children have such experiences as participating in assemblies, in PTA programs, in club meetings, in community plays, in interclass activities, Sunday school and church group work, Boy and Girl Scout activities, telephoning, television and radio programs, conversations at the dinner table at home, storytelling and reading in the home, and graduation exercises.

Classroom teachers' opinions concerning speech needs were very similar. The one most frequently mentioned was that the school ought to have well-trained personnel to direct a speech program in the school and to help the classroom teacher and parent. Others were that there ought to be a program of speech development for every pupil and a supplementary program providing for speech correction and improvement for students with speech problems; that there should be in-service training for the classroom teachers; that high schools should offer courses in fundamentals of speech and in dramatics; that more activities in dramatics and assemblies should be available to students; that there should be better facilities for presenting various types of programs; that the library should have a collection of books on speech; that there should be facilities for making and preserving a tape recording of each pupil's speech; and that teachers and pupils should pay more attention to better listening.

Our conclusions from our observations reinforce and supplement the opinions teachers expressed in their answers to the questionnaire. Although the daily classroom programs seem rich

with activities and experiences in speech and dramatics, during conference hours the teachers expressed feelings of inadequacy concerning their utilizing these activities for improving faulty speech patterns. A common question was, "What should I say and do when a child has difficulty with his speech?"

The questions teachers asked when we discussed the findings of the surveys confirmed their opinions (as recorded on the questionnaire) that there should be more in-service training of teachers. We believe that all teachers, principals, and superintendents should have practical background information concerning the scope and philosophy of a good program in speech education, and about the training a speech specialist needs in order to serve a school well. This in-service training should also be directed to improve the teachers' own speech patterns and to giving them a practical knowledge of phonetics. Teachers would feel more secure in the classroom if they knew how to correct the "garden variety" of speech problems and if they had the techniques basic to producing good plays.

So far as equipment is concerned, we thought that all the schools we surveyed should own and use more tape recorders, record players, audiometers, and other audio-visual aids useful in teaching speech. (One of the schools lacked even an auditorium for assemblies!)

Since we made the surveys, one system has appointed a full-time teacher of speech in the high school, and in the same county there is a teacher of speech correction and improvement who works with the children who most need help. In one of the large rural areas there is a teacher trained in speech who teaches

speech part-time and regular classroom work part-time. In two other systems there are plans for a teacher of speech and for some in-service courses.

III

Concerning our third approach to meeting the specific speech needs of public schools there is little to write. Approximately seventy-five children, youths, and adults from twenty-five different communities and centers regularly attend the Speech Laboratory at Montclair State Teachers College. For the most part these people come to the college because the services they need are not available in their own schools or communities.

IV

Although it is a less common service than the one I have just described, our fourth means of helping to meet the specific speech needs in public schools can be described almost as briefly. As part of the entrance requirements to the college, every candidate for the freshman class comes to the Speech Division for an interview. Students majoring and minoring in speech (who have had sufficient training) talk with the candidate about his interests and have him read briefly. Those candidates with perceptible difficulties in speaking or reading go to the faculty member trained to diagnose the difficulty, who recommends whether the college grant or refuse the prospective student admission to the freshman class.

Perhaps two charts can best summarize what we believe is the best way for public schools to meet specific needs in speech and the method by which teachers colleges can help them:

Preven
throug
paren

in

Cer
the pr
is sti
add
spee
not i

1. We
gra
tra
de

2. W
co
su
H
le
el
h
m
to
g
u
i
c
t
e
c

THE ROLE OF A WELL-TRAINED TEACHER OF SPEECH IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Co-ordinator and Director
of a

Program in Speech Education

Trained in Speech Arts,
Science, and Correction

Provides for the

Preventive Aspect
through wise counsel to
parents and teachers

Developmental Aspect
through an enriched
program for all pupils

Corrective Aspect for
those students with
speech problems requiring
remedial work

THE SPEECH PROGRAM IN A TEACHERS COLLEGE

Recruiting and Screening
to Insure
Good Candidates
Training Strong Majors and
Minors in Speech
in both Speech Arts and Science

Requiring a Basic Course
in Speech
of all Sophomores
Providing in-service
Extension Courses for Teachers,
both on and off campus

V

Certain basic assumptions underlay the program we have begun (and which is still evolving); our experience has added other tenets to our philosophy of speech education, which appears below not in its final, but in its current, form:

1. We believe that speech should be an integral part of a school program, and that training in speech should include preventive, developmental, and corrective aspects.
2. We believe that specialization in speech correction and rehabilitation is not in itself sufficient training for the teacher of speech. He should have classroom experience (at least student teaching, if no other) on both elementary and high school levels, he should have at least background classes in fundamentals of speech to improve his own patterns, and he should have sufficient background in literature and the speech arts to utilize well the techniques of public speaking, choral speaking, oral interpretation, and dramatics. Without these basic skills we think the teacher of speech will be at a disadvantage in attempting to serve the other teachers in the school system.
3. We highly recommend that prospective teachers receive along with their theory sufficient practicum to enable them to go into

classrooms to help teachers, to give excellent demonstrations, to serve well the child needing special remedial work, to set up programs which will be an integral part of the school system, cumulative in direction from the kindergarten through the twelfth grade, and to give sound advice and assistance to parents, teachers, and administrators to help meet pupils' needs on preventive, developmental, and corrective bases. The speech teacher should be able to work closely and effectively with other specialists in the school system.

4. In spite of current and future shortages of teachers, we should keep our standards of recruitment of teachers (of all subjects and on all levels) high, so that only those who demonstrate (or who have the potential to demonstrate) good speech patterns themselves be eligible for admission to teachers colleges.
5. We think it imperative that all prospective teachers receive their required and elective speech instruction from instructors who themselves have had excellent training and experience. To entrust these courses to incompletely trained and inexperienced teachers is to jeopardize our cause.
6. We believe that State Departments of Education should be informed of all findings of surveys (and other work with and in the public schools) so that state officials may

be informed of speech needs and may work as leaders to make the configuration complete: state, county, town, school, college—all working together to meet specific needs.

7. We think, too, that all should co-operate to prevent exploitation of a child handicapped in speech (or other function) through posters and publications presented in a sentimental way to arouse the public's sympathy. There is a danger that well-meaning societies and welfare groups may further such trends. We believe that for good mental health and good social adjustment we should meet the needs of *all* children, without calling attention to those needs and without emotional and sentimental overtones.
8. We should like to see the continuation of present in-service courses in speech, and their inauguration in schools which do not now have them. We think, however, that the instructors of such courses should be those who can best present and demonstrate methods and materials to the busy teacher. Principals and superintendents, especially, should learn the qualifications of a good teacher of such in-service courses, for there

is the danger that they may appoint technically over-specialized clinicians who have too little (or even no) knowledge of and experience in the classroom to give classroom teachers much help in solving their everyday practical problems.

9. We believe that teachers colleges and public schools must work together closely if our programs in speech education are to be fruitful. Whatever the pupil's background, ability, or experience, we want him as a result of our speech education to be able effectively to use the skills of oral communication in the situations in which he finds himself.

We are sure that there are other methods of determining the specific speech needs in public schools, and of helping to meet them. We will appreciate hearing from members of speech departments in other teachers colleges how they are helping to determine and meet the specific speech needs in the public schools in the communities they serve.

EXCURSUS

VII. METHODS FOR SELF-CULTURE.

The living teacher, as a model, is better than all books of rules upon elocution; yet, if the pupil cannot be drilled by a master in the art, he may study carefully some good work upon the subject, and if he is observing and has no serious defect of voice, may still make much progress in self-culture. The following table of exercises are recommended as helps for developing and improving the voice:

1. Breathing deeply and slowly, rapidly and explosively.
2. Reading in a whisper so distinctly as to be readily heard throughout a large room.
3. Reading loudly in doors, out of doors, and when running up hill.
4. Read slowly and rapidly alternately.
5. Read high and low alternately.
6. Read heavy and gentle alternately.
7. Increase and diminish in force alternately.
8. Read up and down the musical scale alternately.

—Anna T. Randall, *Reading and Elocution: Theoretical and Practical* (New York: Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Co., 1869), p. 33.

ORAL COMMUNICATION IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIVING

Mardel Ogilvie

LIVING in an elementary school classroom today demands talk. Formal or informal, it serves different purposes. Children talk to share an experience, to entertain others, to inform or to explain, to persuade their classmates to their way of thinking, to solve a problem, or to debate an issue.

Probably the greatest amount of talk in the elementary school is conversation. The word comes from the Latin meaning "to live together"; and effective conversation is a basic requirement for successful living together in today's elementary school classroom. Since most children enjoy each other's company, their effectiveness in expressing themselves adds to their happiness in being with others. Furthermore, children accomplish a part of the work in the classroom through conversation.

Schools try to stimulate conversation. Teachers provide for the elements that motivate conversation and that make it more interesting. In one seventh grade classroom where the children were talking freely and intelligently, Johnny was proudly displaying his model airplane. A group of children had gathered around him to examine it and to praise his accomplishment. Several of them asked where he had bought the mater-

ials. Other students were leafing through and voicing interest in *The Dramatic Story of the Theatre*,¹ which the teacher had brought in. Members of this class had had considerable experience in putting on plays, for dramatic activity was a favorite with them. Other children were discussing the plans of the citizens of the town to build a swimming pool. Still others were reminiscing about a recent trip to an ice cream factory. And others were chatting about the forthcoming election in which they would elect the representative for their class to the student council. Such elements as these inspire conversation. The construction of objects, displaying interesting bulletin board exhibits, providing for common interests, planning trips, stimulating appreciation of local problems, encouraging activity in the room, furnishing magazine articles or books of interest to the group, all suggest topics for conversation that are exciting to children.

Success in conversation depends partly on the ability of the children and of the teacher to listen carefully and sympathetically to each other. In a fourth grade class, the teacher had asked several parents to help with the transportation of her students to a factory. The daughter of a mother who offered to take her own child, but no others, though loyal to her mother, was disconcerted by her action. The daughter's teacher had a ritual of saying "good night" to all her students at the close of each day's work.

As a Consulting Editor and frequent contributor (most recently of "Assemblies in the Elementary School: A Bibliography" in the issue for March, 1956), Professor Ogilvie requires no introduction to readers of *The Speech Teacher*. In collaboration with one of her colleagues at Queens College, Professor Jon Eisensohn, Professor Ogilvie has recently completed a new book, *Speech Correction in the Schools*, which The Macmillan Company published late in 1956.

¹ By Dorothy and Joseph Samachson (New York: Abelard-Schuman, Inc., 1955).

This little girl hung back, explaining to the teacher in an apologetic tone that children made her mother nervous. The teacher responded with the statement that many adults feel just that way, and that different kinds of situations make each of us nervous. The child, feeling better, ran happily from the school. Her teacher had taken the time to listen to and to be sympathetic with the child's problem. Conversation would be easier for them another time.

Listening is important in any speech situation. The teacher can help children to listen better in each situation and to realize that different kinds of listening exist. She can make sure that the physical arrangement of the room is such that the children listen to each other readily. When children are placed quite close together in groups they tend to talk and to listen.

Secondly, the attitudes of the persons in the room can motivate listening. A teacher can make different children feel that what they have to say is important. She can give weight to her students' opinions and encourage their classmates to feel that what a member of the group has to say needs a response.

Thirdly, the teacher recognizes the fact that children listen for different purposes. Listening may be casual. While some third-graders were painting, they were listening to music. Some seven-year-olds were chatting about the fall colors of the leaves. In both instances the listening was of a casual kind. A fifth-grade group of children were listening raptly and attentively to the teacher's reading of *Many Moons*.² This listening was appreciative. Other listening is thoughtful and questioning. In thoughtful listening, children listen to ask questions, to analyze what their

classmates are saying, and to respond to it.

Telephoning is one kind of conversation. According to a recent article,³ telephoning among teen-agers is rivaling viewing television as a recreation in some social sets, and what is more, so great is the adaptive power of the young that a few hardy pioneers have already developed the skills necessary to watch a show and simultaneously discuss it by phone with a friend two blocks or two miles away!

The teacher can help children to consider how and why to use the telephone, and to understand how its constant demands affect family life. One teacher asks different children to call the parents of any absent child to find out whether or not there is any way in which his classmates can help him. Another teacher asks her pupils to make the necessary arrangements for class visits by telephone. The children first discuss what they are to say, and sometimes even rehearse some of their telephone conversations.

A large share of classroom talk is involved in children's planning their work with the teacher. Teacher-pupil planning is now a fairly universally accepted technique, for teachers have found it a motivating force for children to attack work and have discovered that in such activity children reveal themselves. They also have learned that teacher-pupil planning is one way to adapt experiences to the maturity of the group.

Planning may involve any number of problems. It may involve some phases of classroom management. For example, one group of seven-year-olds worked out a way to lessen the amount of mud they tracked into the classroom. Another group of nine-year-olds talked about the

² By James Thurber (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1943).

³ Dorothy Barclay, "The Telephoning Teens," *The New York Times Magazine*, 20 May, 1956, 48.

ways of rearranging their furniture to give them more work space.

Secondly, planning may involve the choice of an activity. For example, members of a class may be deciding to which of two places to go for information about transportation by air, or the kind of assembly program to produce for the school.

Thirdly, planning may involve the carrying out of an activity. For instance, when students are to go on a trip to the post office, they may talk about how to get there, what help they will need in making the trip, and what they would like to ask about and see while there.

Fourthly, planning may concern work that must be done. Pupils may want to know how to find out more about the building of the New York State Thruway.

Finding the solutions to such problems usually involves five steps, the five steps of group discussion: stating the problem, analyzing it, examining the solutions proposed, choosing the best of them, and putting it to work.

Lucile Lindberg⁴ illustrates the use of discussion techniques in the children's solving the problem, "What can we do about the soggy condition of part of our playground?" They analyzed the problem: What caused the condition? How long had the playground been soggy? Had anybody tried to do anything about it? Then they began to read to find solutions. They read articles in the encyclopedia and sections of their science books. Finally they went to a local plumber to find out what he would suggest. After a discussion of various solutions, they decided that draining was necessary. As they worked on putting the solution to work, however, they dis-

covered that they had to consult the city council, for they learned that a city permit was necessary before they could begin their draining. With the aid of the city council, the children helped to drain the playground.

The problem for discussion may concern a party for parents at the end of a unit of work. After one group of nine-year-olds had studied Norway, they decided that they would like to share with their parents the information they had acquired. They had several problems to solve: (1) When would they have the party? (2) Whom should they invite—both parents, or just their fathers? (3) How would they tell their guests about the work they had just completed? The first two problems they solved rather readily, but the third was a little more intricate. As they analyzed the problem, they decided that the presentation should be entertaining to watch, should be informative, should be the kind of presentation that they could give successfully, and should be comparatively simple. They proposed several solutions. The first was a dramatic presentation of life in Norway. As they discussed the advantages and disadvantages of this solution, they arrived at the decision that the costuming and the preparation of necessary scenery would consume too much time. As a second solution they considered a series of reports and discussions telling of their work on Norway. They decided against this solution, for they agreed that a series of talks might bore their parents. One child remarked that his parents frequently turned off panel discussions on television. This comment led to the examination of a third solution, upon which the members of the group agreed. They planned their program as they would a television show. They decided to introduce the summary of their study with a Norwegian song. They were then to write the

⁴"Social Studies in the Context of Social Living," *Social Studies for Children*, Bulletin No. 57, 1955-1956 (Washington: Association for Childhood Education [International], 1956), pp. 15-22.

story of Norway, illustrating each part of the story with drawings. For example, they suggested that they might tell about Norway's being a land of mountains and lakes, and show pictures of them. These were to be small pictures projected on a screen. Children who wrote the various parts of the story would read them to the group. After they had chosen this solution, they worked out the additional details of presenting their show. They discovered how to put their solution to work.

Of course the teacher does not use the language of Dewey's reflective thinking in teaching this process of problem solution. But she does make sure that in general the members of the group follow the five steps. For example, she does not say, "How can we put this solution to work?" Rather, as in the case of these children and their television show about Norway, she asks, "How can we plan this show?"

Often the children need help in directing their thinking in all five steps. The help may involve even the stating of the problem. For example, one group of twelve-year-olds was to study the growth of the railroads in our country. Their talk about how they would study this topic lacked direction. At one point one child remarked that he could sing a railroad song. Because all the children became enthusiastic about this suggestion, the resulting study was one of American railroad songs. The study, although interesting and entertaining, was limited in scope. If the teacher had phrased the problem as, "What do we need to know about the growth of railroads to help us understand their place in the history of transportation in our country?" the resulting study would have been more worth while.

Children learn to participate in discussion effectively. They know that they must listen attentively and critically.

They learn to take turns in speaking. They speak only when they have sufficient information and background to support their statements. They stop to consider different points of view from their own. They stick to the problem. They learn to accept the decision of the group. In other words, the discussion that takes place in teacher-pupil planning helps children to learn to live in a democratic world.

Children spend time not only in conversing and in discussing, but also in giving talks, formal and informal. Some are pure entertainment. For example, one seven-year-old girl told to her classmates the tale of her baby brother's being lost. She told about her embarrassment when the lifeguard held the screaming child high, the amusement of those sitting on the beach at her frantic search for young Flip, and her mother's annoyance at her father's having let Flip slip away while he read his newspaper. Her delightful sense of humor was evident throughout.

Children also persuade each other, their parents, and their teachers. Some eleven-year-olds, particularly interested in their town's going ahead with a projected skating rink, were most persuasive. Very effectively they answered adults' claims that the rink would be too expensive, would lead to children's getting hurt, and would be a burden on the taxpayers.

More frequently the talks are informative ones in which the children report on a specific topic which has to do with the subject matter they are studying. Examples of this kind of informative talk are reports given by a group of ten-year-olds studying the early history of their town. These children reported on the housing, the layout of the streets, the government, and the kind of people who lived in their town in the 1750's. One child visited for the first

time a furnished that era. cilities, t and the his asking was part cause so it in the As the their rep more in they kn and to t society, that per the tow school,

time a house built around 1725, still furnished according to the fashion of that era. His account of the cooking facilities, the utensils, the canopied beds, and the standing desk was the result of his asking questions of the caretaker. He was particularly proud of this house, because some of his ancestors had lived in it in the early days of our country.

As the members of the group planned their reports, they learned how to find more information. They reviewed what they knew, went to the local museum and to the officers of the local historical society, read the books written about that period in the town, visited some of the town's first houses, its first rural school, and a nearby country church

built at the time the town was being founded. From their knowledge, their observation, their interviews, and their reading, they prepared the material for their reports. The members of this group learned how to find information, to take notes, how to select and organize material, and how to present the material to their classmates.

Children in the elementary school, then, are learning to converse with others, to discuss a problem, and to give talks formally and informally to entertain, persuade, and inform. As they are using this oral language in school living, the good elementary school teacher helps children to use their speech skills more effectively and successfully.

EXCURSUS

I. PRIMARY.

1. PRELIMINARY EXERCISE.

(For calling the words at sight.)

1. Reversed manner. Teacher and children alternating one word each.
2. Reversed manner. Boys and girls alternating, one word each.
3. Reversed manner. Careless pupils alternating, with class.
4. Reverse manner. Each pupil reading a line as rapidly as possible.
5. Pupils spell and define difficult words.

2. READING EXERCISE.

(After the lesson has been thoroughly studied.)

1. Teacher asks questions upon the lesson.
2. Children read and criticise each other, giving reasons.
3. Teacher reads wrong, or without expression. Children criticise.
4. Children read in concert after teacher.
5. Books closed. Children give substance of lesson in their own language.

—Anna T. Randall, *Reading and Elocution: Theoretical and Practical* (New York: Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Co., 1869), p. 35.

CO-OPERATION BETWEEN HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE IN THE TEACHING OF ORAL INTERPRETATION

Ralph N. Schmidt

THAT oral interpretation is of value to the student in general speech is the thesis of a recent essay by Ordean G. Ness.¹ In the penultimate paragraph of his essay, Professor Ness writes,

Of course, significant though the benefits of the oral interpretation course may be, they are not automatically realized. The student needs the guidance of instructors who recognize these values, who can intelligently help him achieve them. The teachers' approach must be realistic. Superficiality and hyper-romanticism have no place in any communicative process, nor in the teaching of that process.²

In the present writing I am assuming that my readers are "instructors who recognize these values"; I am concerned with a "realistic approach" by which such instructors can "intelligently help him achieve them."

For the past two years students in oral interpretation at Utica College of Syracuse University have been assigned to read before the speech classes of one or more of the co-operating local high schools (Utica Free Academy, Proctor High School, and St. Francis de Sales

High School). This reading before high school classes is a method which realistically and intelligently helps the student to achieve in optimal degree (for him) the values Mr. Ness has delineated so well. In the opinion of the instructor, of the high school teachers, and of the student interpreters themselves, this co-operation between college and high school in the teaching of interpretation has added to the growth of the individual interpreters and to their ability to communicate with others.

Undoubtedly other teachers of interpretation have used this method, and still others have experimented with it and discarded it as not being feasible. Since circumstances vary in the different communities in which colleges are situated, and since conditions within colleges and universities differ, I do not presume that all instructors in oral interpretation will find it practical to use this method. I give the following explanation of it for those whose circumstances and conditions make it possible at least to experiment with this method.

The first step is to solicit the co-operation of the high school by consulting with the head of the department of speech and through him with the individual teacher(s) of speech. Any permission necessary to obtain from the high school administration is in the province of the high school teacher of speech.

Having received the assurance of co-operation, the next step is to obtain a copy of the daily schedule of the high

This essay marks Professor Schmidt's first appearance in *The Speech Teacher* since the publication of his "A Philosophy to Guide Us in Teaching Public Speaking" in the issue for January, 1956. In the interim he has written several articles for *The Sample Case*, the official publication of the United Commercial Travelers of America.

Professor Schmidt, who received his Ph.D. from Syracuse University, is Chairman of the Department of Speech at Utica College of Syracuse University.

¹"The Value of Oral Interpretation to the Student in General Speech," *The Speech Teacher*, V (September, 1956), 209-213.

²*Ibid.*, p. 213.

school: the number of class periods in the day, the exact time at which each begins and ends, the periods at which classes in speech meet, the areas of speech which the pupils in each class are studying, and the level (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, or mixed) of the pupils.

It is important to ascertain as well on which days of the week regular assemblies and the like alter this schedule, and the extent to which special assemblies and other programs will alter the regular schedule.

The fourth step (which, of course, can be concurrent with the two preceding ones) is to solicit from the college students in oral interpretation their daily schedules of classes, extracurricular activities, and work. It is important to make sure that each student lists accurately his schedule for each of the days in the regular school week.

The daily schedule of high school classes will seldom coincide with the college schedule. High school periods are usually shorter than college class periods; a high school class meeting from 9:38 to 10:18 will cut across two college classes meeting at 9:00 and 10:00. This overlapping presents a problem in scheduling college interpreters to appear before high school classes without being absent from all or part of a college class. The teacher of interpretation will do well to avoid as much as possible his interpreters' "cutting" classes of other instructors.

To insure a minimal conflict with other college courses, it is wise to make a master chart which will show at a glance which college students are free to attend a particular high school class without missing any part of a college class, which students would miss only a brief portion of a class, and which students cannot appear before any high school class without missing part or all of one or more of their own classes. This

is the fifth step. From this master chart it is possible to work out the specific assignment of college readers for any particular day.

The college instructor should consider that the time of the oral interpretation class is expendable in a program of co-operation between high school and college in the teaching of oral interpretation. A student who has conflicts at every other hour has none at the hour he meets his class in oral interpretation. Students reading before high school audiences are participating in the work of the oral interpretation course. Hence the teacher of that course should not hesitate to excuse the absence from his class of students who are presenting readings to a high school audience. They are putting in as much time as they would in class attendance, and they are gaining more than they would from being in the college classroom.

If any student's program is such that he cannot read to any high school class without missing some college class, a consultation with the student is in order. He knows better than anyone else which of his classes he can miss with the least disadvantage to himself, which of his instructors will most willingly co-operate with him, and permit (and help) him to make up any work he may miss. A consultation with his instructor is also in order. It may be by means of the telephone or over a cup of coffee. It goes without saying that the instructor should know well ahead of time when one of his students is going to read for a high school audience. Informed well enough in advance, the instructors in other courses will seldom refuse to co-operate with the instructor in oral interpretation and his students.

It should be obvious that there must be as many master charts as there are co-operating high schools. It should be equally obvious that the distance be-

tween the colleges and the high school and the available transportation are important considerations. (Yet the instructor and student can overcome these problems of time and distance if they have both the desire and interest to do so.)

The sixth step in setting up a program of co-operation between college and high school in the teaching of oral interpretation is adjusting the high school and college schedules with respect to the subject matter and activities of classes in both. It is not co-operation for the college instructor to announce to the high school teacher that interpreters will appear in the latter's classes tomorrow to read such and such materials. If the high school teacher submits to such tactlessness (or arrogance!), he is not co-operating with the college instructor, but capitulating to him! Knowing what high school classes are doing enables the college reader to select material which will supplement, complement, review, or preview their work, instead of interrupting it.

At Utica College I have found the easiest way to effect this adjustment is to analyze my own syllabus to determine the dates on which my students will be ready to read certain types of material, and then to ask the high school teachers whether or not it would suit their plans to have college students read for their classes on those clearly specified days.

The high school teacher should know what kind of material (descriptive, expository, narrative, dramatic, poetic) the college student will read, the total number of college readers, the amount of time each presentation requires, the number of college students that will appear before each high school class, and the amount of experience and instruction the readers have had in reading the materials they will present to high school students. This is the seventh step.

When high school and college teach-

er have mutually agreed on the dates on which college students are to read to high school classes, the instructor in oral interpretation should assign to his students the exact times at which they are to read. Each should know to which class he will read, and where and when it meets. He should also know about any special arrangements for a high school student to meet him at a specific entrance to the high school, at the principal's office, or elsewhere, to conduct him to the high school class. If more than one college reader is assigned to the same high school class on the same day (and usually two college readers will appear together), each student should know which other student will be on the same program so that the two can arrange to go to the high school together, decide the order of their presentations, plan their introductions, and make any other arrangements which should be mutual. This constitutes the eighth step.

It is not desirable, however, to send college interpreters out to read to high school audiences until the former have had sufficient time to learn textbook expositions of principles, to discuss these principles in the classroom, to apply them in the preparation of selections (some of which the instructor assigns, some of which the students select) for presentation in the college classroom, to give criticism, suggestions, and recommendations concerning their classmates' reading, to receive classmates' criticisms of their own readings, and to receive both individual and group instruction from the college teacher of oral interpretation.

To make sure that our college interpreters will be well prepared, at Utica College we have not made assignments to read in high schools until late in the first term. By the tenth week our students have studied and discussed princi-

ples, the practice, the instructor relevant to interpretation, general implications. By their words, pathetic.

It is college a high of the the eig have fo pository ation b lecting appeal dition also fo lege re their c them t experie

the cri tor, th proach proved tively tent, r

To to the ble, w names read Thus duce stude the h limin read.

Sim ca an lengt to a wher read

ples, they have experienced classroom practice, they have heard students' and instructors' criticisms and comments relevant to techniques and variant interpretations of selections, and have in general improved their oral reading abilities. By this time they are ready to "try their wings" before a strange, yet sympathetic (and contemporary) audience.

It is at this time that we tell the college students that they are to read at a high school and give them the rest of the information I have specified for the eighth step. At Utica College we have found it desirable to choose expository or descriptive prose for presentation before high school audiences, selecting materials which have a special appeal to the high school student in addition to a universal appeal. We have also found it desirable to have our college readers present their selections to their classmates prior to their reading them to high school classes. With this experience behind them, fortified with the criticisms of classmates and instructor, the student interpreters have approached the high school classes with improved confidence in their ability effectively to communicate the author's content, meaning, and feeling.

To make the experience of reading to the high school as meaningful as possible, we tell the high school teachers the names of the college students who will read and the length of their selections. Thus the high school teacher can introduce the readers (or have one of his students do so) and, if he wishes, have the high school students make some preliminary study of the selections to be read. This is the ninth step.

Since high school class periods in Utica are approximately forty minutes in length, we have usually limited readings to a maximum time of ten minutes, and whenever feasible we have sent two readers to each class. Thus it has been

possible for our readers to hear the high school students' oral comments on their efforts. (Twenty minutes of reading, plus about five minutes for introductions, leaves about fifteen minutes for these oral reactions.) The high school teacher has usually added her oral evaluation to the students'. Sending two readers to the same classroom has provided the added advantage of at least one "friendly and familiar face" in the audience—with all that means for comfort and confidence!

As a check on the effectiveness of this program of co-operation, we give both college student interpreters and high school teachers a report form on which they record their reactions to this experience. These help the college instructor to evaluate the performances and to counsel the student reader and give him individual assistance. Making sure that teacher and reader receive these report forms is the tenth step.

In the college classes in oral interpretation we provide an opportunity for each student to report on his experiences at the high school. These reports help those students who have not yet read to high school students to adjust to any unforeseen conditions or circumstances. Since students uniformly report that they enjoy the experience, their classmates who have not yet read feel more poised and confident in hearing of their predecessors' success. These reports also help those who have already read by confirming their own experiences and reactions and helping them to prepare for their next high school reading.

This next assignment comes in the final two weeks of the first term. For this reading there is no previous appearance in the college classroom; this time the high school reading is the preparation for the college classroom. At Utica College, oral interpretation students pre-

sent a twenty-minute "final program" as a part of the semester examination. They present their final programs during the final examination week at the time the registrar has designated for the written final examination. (Students take the final written examination on the last day of classes.) Students not only have no classroom preparation for this final program; they receive no individual instruction for it as well. The student is "on his own" as he develops and prepares his program. Consequently this presentation of part of the final program to a high school class is a welcome rehearsal.

For their final programs we urge students to select materials which have a universal appeal, which are suitable not only to high school students, but also to such community groups as the PTA, church groups, service clubs, and the like. (We frequently receive calls for student readers to appear before such groups and before high school English classes; these audiences offer the college interpreters another opportunity to gain practical experience to augment classroom practice and the co-operative program.)

Since the final programs last for twenty minutes, we send only one student to a high school class for any one period. Thus the interpreter can present his program just as he has planned it. There is no danger that a fellow reader will take more time than he should, or that class response will encroach upon a second reader's time; there is no necessity of counteracting a mood a previous reader has set. There is also more time for discussion of the reading by high school students and teacher. This one-student, one-class ratio takes twice as much time as the earlier two-students, one-class; without the co-operation of the high school teachers we could not

offer our students this rehearsal for their final programs.

In the second semester of our one-year course in oral interpretation students again read to high school classes. In this semester we deal with the interpretation of drama and poetry. Hence each student presents two twenty-minute programs during the term. The general procedure is the same as it is for the first semester, except that in both class periods and individual conference the students receive help in selecting, cutting, and reading the play and verse they will present in their two appearances before high school audiences. Again they present twenty-minute final programs, but they do not have equivalent rehearsal or assistance in preparing them. The results of their preparation constitute the measure of their mastery of the skills of oral interpretation.

The basic pattern for our co-operation between college and high schools has remained the same, but there has been some variation in details during the two years we have practiced it. During the first term college students went to only one high school in each of the two years, and all students enrolled in the course read to the students of The Utica Free Academy. In the second term all students went again to this same school and to one other in addition.

The first year of this co-operative program the second high school to which students went was too far from the college for easy access,³ and not all of the students could take advantage of the opportunity to read before its classes. Furthermore, conflicts between high school and college schedules allowed the

³ To get to Proctor High School from Utica College it is necessary to transfer from one city bus to another, requiring a minimum of forty-five minutes (including waiting) each way. By private automobile or taxicab the trip takes at least twenty or twenty-five minutes.

students who could solve the transportation problem only one appearance at this high school. In the second year, the second high school (St. Francis de Sales) was only three blocks from the college, and all students in the oral interpretation class presented each of their programs at this high school as well as at the one to whose students they had read during the first semester.

How many opportunities to appear before an audience other than their own classmates did this program offer college students in oral interpretation? In the first term of each of the two years, every student had two such opportunities. In the second term, students enrolled in the spring of 1955 had another two experiences (some of them had three); students enrolled in the spring of 1956 had four additional appearances. During the academic year 1954-1956 students had a total of either four or five appearances; this past academic year each appeared six times before a high school audience.

How valuable was this co-operation between college and high school in the teaching of oral interpretation? The following excerpts from letters answer that question:

... The knowledge that we would be reading and interpreting for an audience other than our own class added that extra incentive for making a good preparation better; and I felt that in a high school speech class I was facing a critical but unbiased audience—one whose judgment of my performance I would value more than that of the ordinary community group audience.

Such knowledge certainly was a great asset to my immediate presentations and subsequent ones—both at college and high school. I looked forward to their criticisms, read their suggestions, and incorporated those I felt worth while into my future assignments. For some reason a terse criticism scrawled on the back of note paper will have more effect than pages of text, and will seem to "pop up" before your eyes as a reminder just as you are taking that deep

"belt-line" breath before beginning your reading.

Perhaps the greatest advantage that this high school-college co-operation afforded me was in my over-all growth as an interpreter. It was through this means that I was provided with one of the best measuring sticks—the same audience for different readings. . . .

I surely hope you will be able to continue this sort of co-operation for future classes, for I feel it will be as satisfying and rewarding an experience for them as it was for me.⁴

... as I look back at the times I read to high school classes, there are two advantages that stand out in my mind. The first of these, and I feel the most important, is the actual opportunity it presented for me to obtain an audience. Of course, it is only natural that people had rather listen to experienced readers rather than those who are inexperienced, but it does make it difficult for the beginning reader to have his chance. By being able to read before high school classes, however, I feel that I had my chance . . .

The second reason I feel reading before high school classes was a great advantage is: the experience that I received was of more value than other audiences offered. There were twenty-five to thirty-five students there, which meant a multitude in my eyes at that time. Not only were the audiences larger, but it gave me the opportunity to speak in a real auditorium for the first time. And, of course, I can't forget that it offered an ideal way of obtaining helpful criticism—compared to other audiences.

I don't suppose there is any means of getting helpful criticism except from your own professor, but by listening between the words, I did manage to get helpful suggestions from the high school students I read to . . .⁵

... The students of my classes felt, for the most part, you understand, an admiration for the technique of the college interpreter, a new interest in well-known selections, and a really alert interest in the new, and a few members even wanted a unit put in my course to give them the opportunity to try their wings at the same type of thing.

... It was evident that more time and care had been used in preparing the second pro-

⁴ Sally Ann Mungerson Opalka, now a married graduate, but a college junior at the time she took the course in oral interpretation.

⁵ Carolyn Thurman, a college freshman when she participated in this co-operative program.

grams—it may have been because of the vehicle itself, or it may have been because they realized more that good preparation is absolutely necessary for a successful presentation such as they were giving.

Then, too, the second time, they were used to the physical set-up—stage, auditorium, etc. Also, the “personnel” of my classes is quite (unreasonably) static, so that made “rapport” easier . . .⁶

Has this program of co-operation between college and high school in the teaching of interpretation been of value to the high school students? The following letter, which one of the co-operating teachers received in the fall of 1956, seems to answer that question:

I've just learned that I have attained a “B” average in my English and Speech courses! It is after a few weeks at college that one begins to realize the importance and reap the benefits of a well-rounded high school education. Now more than ever before, I appreciate the various English interpretations given to our class by the [Utica College] students . . . last year.

⁶ Martha Gales, Chairman of the Department of Speech, Utica Free Academy.

They have been invaluable to me. Perhaps the main lesson I learned from these readings was inflection. This, I feel, had more influence on my Speech grade than anything else. The delivery of those selections also produced an appreciation of the beauty of the English language within me. After being in the Liberal Arts course for two months, the beauty of our language seems to grow on you. . . .⁷

The two high schools geographically closest to Utica College have asked us to continue this co-operative program for 1956-1957, its third year. During each term students in oral interpretation will go twice to each of these two high schools, for a total of four presentations per semester, eight per year.

No doubt you will have to adapt this program to suit the needs of your high school or college, but we have found it so successful that I think it worth your serious consideration and even trial.

⁷ Letter from Thomas Pelnik, now a student at LeMoyne College, to Brother Oswin, St. Francis de Sales High School, 5 November, 1956.

EXCURSUS

3. METHODS FOR VARIETY IN TEACHING READING

1. Concert Reading, one pupil naming pauses.
2. Individual Reading, class naming pauses.
3. Boys and girls alternate, reading a sentence each.
4. Reading to mistake.
5. Reading in couples.
6. Giving parts in dialogues.
7. Choosing sides (similar to methods used in spelling).
8. Looking-glass Reading (class imitate one pupil).
9. Naming pupil who reads until some other name is called.
10. Voting for best readers.
11. Dictating lesson, which they copy one day and read the next.
12. Medley Reading (like a round in singing).
13. Volunteer Reading.
14. Giving examples gathered from the play ground. (Let the children read from the blackboard what they have uttered when at play. There is certainly no exercise better suited for teaching natural reading.)—Anna T. Randall, *Reading and Elocution: Theoretical and Practical* (New York: Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Co., 1869), pp. 35-36.

WHAT CAN COURSES IN RADIO AND TELEVISION WRITING ACCOMPLISH?

Edgar E. Willis

ONCE near the end of one of my courses in radio and television writing, a student threw his last script on my desk with a gesture of disgust and said, "Well, I've learned one thing from this course: I'll never be a writer." His remark immediately gave rise to an important question: Was this small contribution to the student's self-knowledge the sole contribution of the course, or had it accomplished other objectives than this negative conclusion? What made this question particularly urgent was that the student's statement about himself applied to many of his classmates: most of them would never be writers. In fact, to consider them as budding professionals would not only have been unrealistic, but would also have been out of keeping with the basic general education objectives of many of the curricula in which these courses appear. True, a few students may become writers, or find careers in broadcasting in other ca-

pacities, but we cannot defend courses if they serve merely the needs of this small minority. To be justified, they must play a role in making all students better rounded, more cultured individuals, prepared to play an effective part as citizens of democracy.

To begin with, it seems obvious that a course in writing for radio and television can make the same kind of contribution to a student's growth that any course in writing accomplishes. That the work is in the form of a script or continuity does not lessen its value as a means of developing proficiency in communication. The problem of motivating students to write, moreover, may be less difficult than it is in some other types of writing classes. Radio and television are vitally interesting to most students; they are familiar with the various types of programs, and an assignment to produce a script can be an exciting, stimulating experience. Even some teachers of conventional composition classes have found that they can make their students' experiences more vital and meaningful by seasoning the usual diet of themes with an occasional script assignment. By providing training in basic writing techniques, the radio and television writing course can contribute to the student's general education.

There is still another way in which these courses can help the student attain general education objectives. Some knowledge of radio and television, particularly an understanding of their impact on society, seems to be imperative

"This paper . . ." writes the author about it, "is an extension and revision of some remarks I made in a sectional meeting at the SAA convention in Los Angeles last year [1955]." The source is a varied experience: "For five summers I taught the writing courses in the Stanford University-NBC Radio and Television Institute, where training for careers in broadcasting was the basic objective. At the University of Michigan on the undergraduate level the courses in radio and television are expected to fit into a liberal arts program. On the graduate level they aim at a more professional objective. At San Jose State College, where I also taught for a number of years, the objective was general education on the whole, with some professional overtones. . . ."

Dr. Willis is an Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Michigan, where he took his doctorate. Wayne University granted him his bachelor's and master's degrees.

for the educated person who lives in a world in which these media have assumed so dominant a role. The writing course can be an effective means of transmitting this information. An exercise in the writing of commercials, for example, can bring enlightenment concerning the devices advertisers use to influence our actions. Even a consideration of the much-maligned "soap opera" may have its place (not to implant a mastery of its techniques, for it would be a rare teacher indeed who would wish to contribute anything to the nurture of this particular form!), simply to teach something about the characteristics of the people who listen regularly. It is clear, then, that radio and television writing courses have a role to play in the regular liberal arts program.

Some curricula, of course, are frankly designed to prepare students for careers in broadcasting. Here writing courses have an obvious place, but their value is not limited to those who are planning to be writers. Indeed, it might be argued that the writing course may be less valuable to a potential writer than it is to the administrators, producers, directors, and performers of the future. For these people such a course should not be considered merely desirable, but absolutely essential. After all, the product of a writer's effort is constantly involved in the business of broadcasting. The producer who has tried to write a script himself may be somewhat more inclined than his colleagues to provide for his writers those conditions most likely to result in scripts of high quality. A performer may be less likely to condemn a script as inept if he himself has gone through the agony of producing one even more futile. The director who has attempted writing should become a sympathetic and understanding interpreter of a writer's work; especially he

should have learned to avoid that most inexcusable of errors, making arbitrary alterations in scripts, those changes for the sake of change that so enrage a writer and crush his morale.

It is true that some students seem to fear writing courses and avoid them if possible. But every person who looks forward to a career in broadcasting should be urged to take at least one writing course, no matter how much he may disclaim any aptitude or argue his total lack of interest in writing.

What about those students who do want to prepare for writing careers? Can courses help them? As far as those forms usually classified as "continuities" are concerned (opening and closing frameworks, introductions or settings for musical numbers, commercials, newscasts, and special features), a writing course can teach the basic principles and techniques that apply in each instance. Many students can be guided toward vocational competence in these fields, for the basis of success can be the right kind of training, rather than the possession of an unusual gift for writing.

The production of creative work—the original radio or television drama—is, however, another matter. For one thing, professional writers as a group show little enthusiasm for college as a means of preparing for a writing career. John O'Hara thinks that for a person considering a career as a creative writer, four years as a deck hand is better preparation than four years in college, saying simply that a "man is, or he isn't, a writer."¹ William Saroyan shows a similar scorn for college training. Asking the question, "What about courses in colleges and universities in writing?" he

¹ John O'Hara, "Appointment with O'Hara," *Colliers*, CXXXVI, 9 (28 October, 1955), 6.

answers, "Useless, they are entirely useless."²

Well, let us admit that no college course alone ever produced a creative writer. To have a chance for success, a student must enter the course equipped with certain innate talents (call them creative imagination, word sense, the ability to re-experience, or what you will). But assuming that the student does have this essential basic equipment, it seems to me that a course in writing can make certain contributions to his development.

One obvious value is that instruction can provide him with a knowledge of the peculiar technical demands of radio and television. He should learn, for example, how to avoid the pitfalls that make continuous "live" production of a television drama difficult or even impossible. He can become aware of the special taboos and restrictions that limit the radio and television writer: that a milkman, for instance, would be an unwise choice for a villain in a drama to be sponsored by The Borden Company.

The exposition of certain principles with respect to such matters as material, theme, plotting, characterization, and dialogue may also be helpful. Here there is danger, however. There is a temptation to set down a rigid set of regulations, and this is difficult to resist because the student is so desperately searching for formulas to solve his problems. But no rule is more certain than the one that rigid rules should be avoided. As Wallace Stegner has said, "... the teacher of a writing course must be wary of all formulas, and above all of his own."³ If we teach formulas,

we may force the student's writing into the common mold, thus snuffing out his potentialities for originality and innovation.

This danger can be avoided, however, and still the student can be provided with a set of criteria that will help him to evaluate his work. Thus, a student who detects in his work a certain vagueness or fuzziness may discover as the result of a lecture on viewpoint that he can gain unity by telling his story through the eyes of a single individual. To cite other examples, he may realize that his script is dull because he has permitted his characters merely to talk about the crises in their lives, rather than showing them experiencing those crises; he may realize that he has lessened the impact of his work by telling too much, thus leaving too little to the imagination of his audience. These examples are factors of form and design that exist separately from the content of a script. Isolating and defining them for a student can help to provide him with measuring rods by which he can evaluate his own work. Knowing these principles cannot make a writer. But such knowledge can help develop and focus existing talents.

There are at least two other ways in which writing courses can help the gifted student. One of these is simply that the demands of the course will force the student to get down to the business of writing. The potential writer who waits hopefully for inspiration will remain just that: a *potential* writer. Course assignment call for regular stints at the desk; from this discipline may grow the habit of writing regularly, no matter what the weather or one's emotional state, a discipline that is important to the writer's success. A second value is that a writing course provides an opportunity for evaluation of the writer's work by someone other than

² William Saroyan, "Twenty Years of Writing," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CXCIV, 5 (May, 1955), 68.

³ Wallace Stegner, Richard Snowcroft, and Boris Ilyin, *The Writer's Art* (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1950), vii.

himself. Even after the course is over, the remembered reactions of his classmates may in effect give him a permanent set of "other eyes" with which to evaluate his own work. One cannot help feeling that if the William Saroyan who condemned college courses in writing as utterly useless had learned what to discard, his reputation would now be more considerable than it is.

Courses in radio and television writing, then, can accomplish a number of objectives. For the large proportion of enrollees who either do not aspire or lack the qualifications to become professional writers, they can teach communication techniques of value to everyone; moreover, they can be an effective means of helping students to understand how radio and television programs influence people. On the professional level, all students hoping for careers in the broadcasting field can gain valuable insights by taking a writ-

ing course. And certainly the potential writer of continuities can learn much from skilled instruction.

For the student whose innate gifts make possible the production of distinguished original drama, there is value in a writing course. In the words of Roy Cowden, distinguished teacher of creative writing, the teacher can assist "the student to discover himself and his own thought, to help him put down on paper and recognize his own private vision of meaning."⁴ In that way he can be guided to make the best use of the gifts he has. This guidance, it must be confessed, probably provides the teacher with his greatest satisfaction. To find a significant talent may be considered reward enough, but to have a part in helping to expand and direct that talent is an even greater reward.

⁴ Roy Cowden, "Teaching Creative Writing," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CXCV, 5 (May, 1955), 72.

EXCURSUS

RULE II.—Language which demands strong emphasis, generally requires the falling inflection.

Under this head may be specified the following particulars:

1§. Command, or urgent entreaty . . .

2§. Exclamation, especially when indicating strong emotion . . .

3§. In a series of words, or members, where each particular is specified with some degree of emphasis, if it be a *commencing series*, the falling inflection is proper at each word or member, except the *last*, which must have the rising inflection; if it be a *concluding series*, the falling inflection is given to each word or member, except the *last but one*, which requires the rising inflection.

4§. When words, which naturally take the rising inflection, become emphatic by repetition or any other cause, they often take the falling inflection. . . .

Exception to the Rule.—While the tendency of emphasis is decidedly to the use of the *falling inflection*, sometimes a word to which the falling inflection naturally belongs, when it becomes emphatic, changes this for the rising inflection . . .—William H. McGuffey, *McGuffey's Newly Revised Eclectic Fourth Reader: Containing Elegant Extracts in Prose and Poetry, with Rules for Reading, and Exercises in Articulation, Defining, etc.* (Cincinnati: Winthrop B. Smith & Company, 1853), pp. 17-18.

A LISTENING COURSE FOR HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS

Ralph Renwick, Jr.

ALTHOUGH a student can improve his listening skill at most age levels, the senior high school year is a particularly opportune time for college-bound students to receive listening training. They readily sense its importance as preparation for their college work.

For a group of high school composition students I developed a listening program requiring one class hour per week for twelve weeks.¹ Two objectives were paramount. First, the student should acquire skill in listening comprehension: He should learn to recognize stated or implied main ideas, to distinguish details, to relate them to the concepts they support, and to discount irrelevancies. Second, he should learn to listen critically: He should be able to evaluate argument and persuasion while listening to them. In short, in his listening habits he should be better prepared for academic work, for business and professional responsibility, and for citizenship.

Nearly everyone agrees that proficiency in listening is almost as important a skill as proficiency in speaking, yet few of us have specific plans for systematically improving our students' listening. In this essay the author presents the details of a program which has had measurable results.

Dr. Renwick is a Harvard man, having taken his A.B. there in 1942, his A.M. in 1944, and his Ph.D. in 1950. Currently he teaches communications skills at Michigan State University. Before coming to his present post he taught literature and argumentation at Brown University.

¹ The course was given at Lansing Eastern High School, Lansing, Michigan, in classes taught by Miss Mildred Toogood and Miss Aleath Garrity.

In accordance with these objectives, the course consisted of two main parts. Moreover, in order to give the students concrete evidence of progress, I gave listening comprehension tests during the first and last class hours. The overall plan was as follows: listening pre-tests, one hour; orientation to comprehension, one hour; listening comprehension practice, four hours; orientation to critical listening, one hour; critical listening practice, four hours; post-test, one hour.

In detail, the various units provided the following activities:

Week I: Listening Comprehension Test, Form A.²

Week II: Orientation to listening comprehension.

This consisted of a short tape-recorded lecture on the value of listening training and the fundamentals of listening comprehension, followed by instructions on note-taking and the reading of a short sample passage for practice.

Week III and V: Training in listening comprehension.

Listening exercises consisted of recorded passages of increasing complexity of organization. Typical subjects were "The Industrial Revolution" and "The Modern Business World's Growing Awareness of Community Responsibility." Each student took notes and evaluated his own listening skill informally by means of class discussion of the recorded passages.

Week VII: Orientation to critical listening.

Students listened to parts of recorded news broadcasts and commentaries. Before hearing the tape each student received a mimeographed sheet of listening suggestions. Sample

² See Clyde W. Dow, "Testing Listening Comprehension of High School Seniors and College Freshmen," *The Speech Teacher*, IV (November, 1955), 239-249.

items, made up from a Walter Winchell broadcast on the Army-McCarthy dispute, were as follows:

1. Loaded words: "political innocent," "phantoms," "routine maneuver," "Fifth-Amendment major," "hisses," "Rosenbergs," "submerged communists."
2. Implications (disregard the short news items at the beginning of the broadcast).
 - a. Charges against *The New York Times*.
 - b. The case of Joseph Lash.
 - c. Stevenson and the Hungarian embassy.
 - d. The McCarthy situation.
3. What kinds of arguments are involved in b, c, and d? Are they valid?

This material was the basis for discussion after the recording was heard.

Week IX: Critical listening.

I had taped half of an "American Forum of the Air" broadcast for this week; the subject was movie censorship. Again, students received mimeographed material with abstracts of questions and answers, and space for notes on the implications of the discussion: Suggestions for Listening to Discussion of Movie Censorship

Content of the Discussion Implications

1. Introduction of speakers; are they experts?
2. Question: What is the difference between censorship and the Hollywood production code?

Mr. Quigley: Censorship is something from the outside.

Mr. Flick: There are three kinds of censorship.

Mr. London: No one should pay any attention to the production code; producers are paying less and less attention to it.

...

Week X: Analysis.

Students analyzed a broadcast by Elmer Davis using methods similar to those they had used in Week VIII.

Week XI: Critical Listening.

Students heard a recording of part of an address by President Eisenhower. They used the following listening suggestions:

- A. On Communists in the United States:
 1. How does President Eisenhower reassure us on this subject?
 2. What solution does he offer for the problem of the person unjustly accused of being a security risk?

B. Our fears of losing friends abroad.

1. What part of this section of the speech is for Americans, what part for our allies?

...

Week XII: Dow Listening Comprehension Test, Form B.³

As a means of evaluating the course, I used a group technique to obtain student opinion. Each class formed groups of five or six students, and every group submitted an unsigned report on the merits and defects of the program. A typical report shows interest in material that is useful and easy to outline:

After careful consideration we have attempted to evaluate the listening lectures given to the composition classes this term. We hope this will serve as a guide in conducting future lectures.

Although most of the topics have been of interest to us, we have not had enough time to work on them. When the time begins to get short, we wonder if we will finish by the end of the hour; and, as a result, we cannot give our full attention to the lecture. If the exercises were limited to approximately twenty minutes, there would be ample time for reviewing and discussing the material. Then the listening passages would be more interesting and beneficial than those used in the present program.

We enjoyed the program on movie censorship because it was a topic that we are all familiar with, and also one in which we are all interested. The news broadcast was about a timely subject, but we felt that we didn't have sufficient time to do anything with the material given. "The Change in U. S. Business" interested the majority of the group because we have studied some of the same information in our Economics class this year. As a whole, we thought that the program on the "industrial

³ Results of pre- and post-tests: The pre-test had an average difficulty of 52.43, the post-test, 46.87. The mean gains of students receiving listening instruction, compared with one section which received no instruction, are as follows:

Control Group:

Pre-test mean: 15.6 (out of a possible 32)

Post-test mean: 15.1

Other Students (5 sections of about 25 each):

Pre-test: 15.3

Post-test: 16.4

Classes which received instruction showed gains varying from .7 to 2.9, and one section lost .4. A program consisting entirely of exercises of established reliability might justify a more elaborate analysis of data.

Revolution" was a rather dull topic, but it provided very good material for outlining.

Two lectures considered least beneficial are "The Ojibwa Indians" and "Why Men Climb Mountains." In both cases we realize that these lectures were on material not previously mentioned, and therefore the student had no background knowledge of the topic. As a result he sometimes became confused. In the passage on the Indians the main ideas did not stand out clearly, and outlining was difficult.

"Why Men Climb Mountains" required some psychology to fully understand it. The lecture did not contain enough facts. A few students found this interesting, but the majority regarded it as of little value. The accompanying test was most confusing. Questions seemed vague, making it difficult to relate the questions and answers.

In conclusion, we feel that the course has been beneficial. It would help to take simple units first, progressing gradually to more difficult ones. At first, they should be easy to follow with, ample time for class discussion. As a whole the listening lectures were certainly worth any student's time who conscientiously desires to improve his listening. Our request is for more lectures on timely economic issues.

This report was made before the classes heard the tapes of Elmer Davis and President Eisenhower. Students were more enthusiastic about these units, perhaps because both class and teacher were by then more skilled in analyzing radio broadcasts. However, the group evaluations are valuable as evidence of the assumptions underlying student reaction.

First, in all the reports there is expression of a strong preference for material which is easy to outline. The listening selections which were most abstract or imaginative were hardest to outline. The ideas they developed were confusing because the students expected concrete facts and found, instead, somewhat suggestive or poetic description and speculation, as illustrated by the following excerpts:

Week II [part of the passage used for practice note-taking]

In their mode of life, [the Ojibwas] were far more rude than the Iroquois, or even the southern Algonquin tribes. The totemic system is found among them in its most imperfect state. The original clans have become broken into fragments, and indefinitely multiplied; and many of the ancient customs of the institution are but loosely regarded. Agriculture is little known, and, through summer and winter, they range the wilderness with restless wandering, now gorged to repletion, and now perishing with want. In the calm days of summer, the Ojibwa fisherman pushes out his birch canoe upon the great inland ocean of the north; and, as he gazes down into the pellucid depths, he seems like one balanced between earth and sky.⁴

Week VI [part of the listening comprehension exercise]

Why do men climb mountains?

The simplest, if perhaps an evasive, answer is that most men don't. Mountains are as old as the earth, mankind's contact with them as old as the race, but the compelling urge to climb and conquer is something very new under the sun. Ancient man did not climb. Primitive man does not climb. To the western mind the superstitions and rituals of the Rongbuk lamas, murmuring over prayer wheels as they gaze at their Chomolungma, may appear to bear slight relation to the world of fact and reality in which we live our lives. Actually, however, they spring from one of the most ancient and deep-rooted of all human attitudes, and the weight of history, of tradition, of the folkways of centuries lies behind them. It is not the Tibetan lamas, turning their prayer wheels, but the men of the West, struggling up the mountainside high above them, who are the exotic and alien ones—the bearers of "a banner with a strange device."⁵

The second assumption was that the material on which they were to practice listening should be useful. Some groups emphasized usefulness from the viewpoint of the prospective college freshman who wants to know how to take

⁴ Francis Parkman, *The Conspiracy of Pontiac and the Indian War After the Conquest of Canada* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1901), I, 38-39.

⁵ James Ramsey Ullman, *High Conquest: The Story of Mountaineering* (Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1941). Reprinted by permission of the publishers.

lecture notes. Others saw usefulness in an economic frame of reference, as in the final request in the quoted report for "more lectures on timely economic issues."

Obviously, these two assumptions were first cousins, if not twins. For these students, material easy to outline consisted of factual support paragraphs, as in the lecture on the industrial revolution. And it is factual material which seems to be useful. Thus the criticisms of the course show a utilitarian orientation which, whether educationally desirable or not, must be the basis for improvement.

And there is much room for improvement. Listening-comprehension training would be more effective in a coherent program of exercises with a central theme suggested by the interests of the class. A college-preparatory class might prefer lectures on choice of college, choice of field of specialization, and similar topics. Students primarily interested in immediate job opportunities might be most responsive to vocational information. Moreover, subject matter is not the only area needing improvement. In a composition class, listening exercises which emphasize observation of

paragraph form and unity would support work in the writing handbook. The use of short word lists would aid vocabulary building as well as listening; the instructor could write a few words from the listening passage on the blackboard and discuss their meanings with the class after reading the listening exercise.

On the other hand, the teaching of critical listening through recorded broadcasts demands arrangement of material according to the speed of communication. Contrary to what one might expect, the news broadcast or news commentary is usually too compact for use as an elementary critical listening exercise. Such programs cover too many subjects and move so rapidly that it is very difficult to analyze argument or persuasion while listening. The instructor can solve this problem by starting critical-listening training with slow-moving programs such as forums and press interviews and progressing through formal speeches to news commentaries and such rapid-fire broadcasts as those of Walter Winchell and Paul Harvey. Obviously these suggestions for a high school listening program represent only a few of the possibilities in this field.

EXCURSUS

EMPHASIS.

There is no better illustration of the nature and importance of emphasis, than the following example, which is substantially the same with one given by Blair, and which has been often quoted. It will be observed that the meaning and proper answer of the question varies with each change of the emphasis.

Did you walk into the city yesterday? Ans. No, my brother went.

Did you walk into the city yesterday? Ans. No, I rode.

Did you walk into the city yesterday? Ans. No, I went into the country.

Did you walk into the city yesterday? Ans. No, I went the day before.

William H. McGuffey, *McGuffey's Newly Revised Eclectic Fourth Reader: Containing Elegant Extracts in Prose and Poetry, with Rules for Reading, and Exercises in Articulation, Defining, etc.* (Cincinnati: Winthrop B. Smith & Company, 1853), p. 25.

A S a
o
Speaking
already
taking
classro
could
but m
throug
talk I
things
second
talk a
cogita
bled
quick
tende
book,
out o
bubb
in.
Fin

The
view
mou
bert,
Nebr
after
the
essay
Divis
State
infor
"M
garte
Teac
majo
Soci
"M
and
at t
juni
Acad
ing
mal
way
trut
tha
Wa

THE POWER OF AN AIR WAVE

Wildon Stirtz

As a frightened, tongue-tied, dreary old lady, I entered my first "Radio Speaking" class. Trying to shrink my already skinny frame to even less space-taking proportions, I sat down in the classroom as far from the instructor as I could get. If he didn't ask for anything but my name, I thought, I could get through it, but if he should ask me to talk I would have to do one of three things: First, pretend I didn't hear; second, say I didn't know anything to talk about; or, third, giggle. I sat and cogitated, bleakly. As the class assembled for this first time I looked up quickly at each new member, then pretended to be very busy reading the textbook, so that I wouldn't seem so left out of the conversation which usually bubbled up when someone new bounced in.

Finally we were all there. I was so

The author of this enlightening student's-eye view of a class submitted her manuscript anonymously by way of her instructor, C. Loyd Shubert, Director of Radio and Forensics at the Nebraska State Teachers College. However, after some editorial suasion, she consented to the appearance of her name along with her essay, and allowed Mrs. Virgil Baker of the Division of Public Relations of the Nebraska State Teachers College to supply the following information about her:

"Mrs. Wildon Stirtz . . . is a senior in Kindergarten Primary training at Wayne State Teachers College, Wayne, Nebraska. A second major in her studies is Speech; her minors are Sociology and English.

"Mrs. Stirtz is the mother of two sons, Jerry and Ronny. Jerry is a senior in the law college at the University of Nebraska and Ronny is a junior in high school at the Lake Forest Academy for Boys, Lake Forest, Illinois. During the process of raising these two precocious males, Mrs. Stirtz discovered that the best way to look at life is to begin with the obvious truth and work from there. It is in this manner that she has written 'The Power of an Air Wave'."

glad to see Jack Backer in the class because I had known him in "Human Development," under Miss Way, and he was a good friend. Then our instructor started to speak. What a comfortable, relaxing voice he had! My right leg, which had been wound once-and-a-half times around my left, slowly unwound and eased out in front of me. After a while I was aware that my hands had ceased perspiring; the lump in my throat was gone; I looked at the person sitting on my right, then at the one on my left; it was the first time I'd had the courage to look at them. They didn't seem to mind if I, of the second generation back, was in their class, so I took a deep breath, fished my notebook out of my portfolio, and started taking notes.

A great many Wayne-State-created air waves have gone out from station WJAG since that first day I sat in radio class. The things I have learned, the gratifying accomplishments I have made, both academically and culturally, are blessings that only I can understand. Only those people who have stood at the bottom of the black pit of self-consciousness, chained there by feelings of inferiority, can know how brightly the sun shines once you have struggled out of those depths.

This, the radio class did for me. Inch by groping inch I made my way toward the daylight. I was aided by a very understanding teacher and a group of the most co-operative and friendly college students that anyone could ever meet.

We learned all about the equipment one finds in a radio station. I was im-

pressed by the provisions the school had made for the laboratory work in this rather new field of study. I longed for, yet dreaded, the day when I would stand before the "mike."

My family, coming in unexpectedly at home, might find me with my face in a corner of the room, loudly reciting poetry. In this way I became accustomed to the sound of my own voice—a voice that didn't sound quite so peculiar to me when, poised before the mike, the technician at the controls, the sound man ready, the second-hand on the clock climbing toward the number twelve, "5," "4," "3," "2," "1"—a finger pointed at me, and I read, "This is Wayne State Teachers College."

Finally I had the opportunity of writing and recording the story of the 1955 Homecoming celebration. Remembering Sir Francis Bacon's advice that "Discretion of speech is more than eloquence," I began the task of telling the pertinent facts concerning this biggest of all our college activities. No tale was ever so carefully written, so minutely edited, or so painstakingly synchronized with the film. Over and over again I ran the movie and read my script aloud. When I had worked on it about a week I learned that I could reverse the film when necessary. This was a tremendous help, and I wished that I had asked about that technical advantage, because I had often thought of it. From then on I made progress. Darlene Anderson was planning the music for the film; Chris Mueller was going to narrate the football game, and Mr. Shubert was to act as general technician. We practiced

together several times, and everything seemed to be in order—everything, that is, except the fact that I talked so many hours the past two weeks that I wasn't sure how much longer my voice would last. The day we were to put the story on the sound track I was awakened by the telephone, went out to answer it, and couldn't speak above a whisper. I missed a class that morning while I went to the doctor. He sprayed my throat, gave me some lozenges, and told me to go home and put warm, wet packs on my throat and chest until noon. This therapy relieved the hoarseness. I didn't mention my session with the packs to the rest of the recording group when we gathered in the studio that afternoon, so I was probably the only one who wasn't surprised when I became very hoarse and had to stop about halfway through the recording. A doctor had once shown me the best way to recover from this symptom, so, while Mr. Shubert rewound the tape, I chewed a throat lozenge and took my breathing exercises. We started over again, and everything went fine. As I drove home that evening I tried to understand the change that had taken place in the person who had enrolled in Radio Speaking only a few months before.

Since then my radio work has been progressively more interesting, more challenging, more satisfying. At the end of this second semester of study I hope I shall be able to express my progress, because of my religious trust and because of the type of guidance I have had, with a paraphrase of Genesis 1:31, "And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good."

TO

B
and
teach st
I would
question
cern to
nament

Both
are so
ess than
these a
portant
not pe
tempts
our cl
and co
who r
bate a
discrin
vant j
and h
effecti

Th
enhar
cussio
howe
withi
anti-t

It is
questi
thor
tions
many
The
quest
to "7
to p
discu
the
Mi
the
Fore
Clain
State
Wis

TOURNAMENTS: FOR BETTER OR WORSE?

Grace Walsh

BECAUSE I direct and judge debate and discussion tournaments and teach students who participate in them, I would like to examine several serious questions which should be of grave concern to everyone who gets on the tournament treadmill.

Both debate and discussion activities are so essential in the democratic process that those critics who try to relegate these activities to places of little importance in educational procedures do not perturb me. I doubt that their attempts will be successful; fortunately, in our classrooms and legislative councils and conventions there are many people who remember learning from their debate and discussion experiences how to discriminate values, how to make relevant judgments, how to think logically and how to communicate their thoughts effectively.

The question of whether tournaments enhance or decrease the value of discussion and debate does concern me, however. We have witnessed, especially within the last six years, an upsurge of anti-tournament or anti-contest attitude.

It is axiomatic that discussion begins with a question, debate with a proposition. The author of this candid essay raises several questions (or perhaps a single major question with many subdivisions). It may be that readers of *The Speech Teacher* will want to discuss these questions further (in other essays or in letters to "The Forum"); perhaps they are ready now to phrase a proposition emanating from this discussion and uphold either the affirmative or the negative side.

Miss Walsh is Professor of and Chairman of the Department of Speech and Director of Forensics at Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire. She received her B.E. from Superior State College, her Ph.M. from the University of Wisconsin.

What charges their critics have hurled at these competitions! Students have heard dire warnings that tournament participation will make them anti-social, demoralized, and dishonest. One extreme critic even hints at the probability that participation in tournaments will result in psychopathic problems.

While I have not observed any behavior which I consider psychopathic, I do think that our zest makes us very vulnerable to attack by those who feel less enthusiastic than we. I, who certainly number myself among the enthusiasts, have seriously pondered such questions as, How many times should a student have the opportunity to represent his school in interscholastic tournaments? At what point does further discussion or debate cease to enlighten a student concerning any particular problem? Have we a moral right to run risks by travelling on unsafe roads to tournaments which have become marathons running until midnight? What about the faculty ill will that absences from classes cause? What about scholastic pressure on the student?

Fearing that this barrage of questions may make you think I am somewhat psychopathic (or at least neurotic) myself, I want to assure you that these questions are just a few of the typical ones which disturb all forensic directors.

The students, too, have questions about tournaments. Most of all, they wonder how and why judges can be so wrong. In the absence of any check on the qualifications of judges at many

tournaments, it is not surprising that students lose any faith they may have in judges. I am not referring to those honest differences of opinion which arise from the essential subjectivity inherent in the consideration of controversial questions. I am referring to the kind of critique which turns up in most tournaments whose judges are unqualified. At a recent tourney a boy with a speech defect read, "You must never in your life ever admit that you have this weakness, even though you know it is true. From now on be determined to bury it deep." Fortunately, this boy had made much progress in overcoming his difficulty and was experiencing a great deal of satisfaction from participating in speech tournaments. He had been successfully conditioned to his problem and he understood it. He saw in this judge's criticism evidence of the judge's appalling ignorance of modern speech therapy.

At the national conventions of honorary speech fraternities, speakers surely have the right to expect helpful criticism. At a recent national meeting, one of the debate judges asked the debaters what a debate is, how many sides there are, and then apologetically explained that he had never before heard a debate. He then proceeded to "judge."

The unqualified have no monopoly on mistakes, as the following anecdote will attest. Some of my students are unenthusiastic about participation in competitive discussion. I allowed one of them, very poorly prepared, to compete in that event. I thought he would learn the importance of preparation. He was highly amused to be selected as a finalist and then, in that major tournament, to receive first place and the outstanding award in the event! The superlative praise in the judges' comments seemed ludicrous to the student, who

knew that his lack of information should have disqualified him from any honor. He had been taught that knowledge is essential for effective discussion, but the tournament results negated that principle.

There are other injustices and charges which I might cite, and yet in the face of many justifiable criticisms, tournaments continue to grow in popularity. For twelve years we have sponsored tournaments for high schools and colleges in a twelve-state (mostly Middle Western) area. We find that every year there are more entries than there were the year before, and more schools apply for invitations. The whole tournament idea applied to speech is less than a quarter of a century old in most places, and yet tournaments are more and more popular. That increasing popularity is not necessarily proof that tournaments are getting better all the time, but I believe they are. That conviction comes from many observations, some of which I want to report below.

It is encouraging to see that more students can participate in tournaments because many tournaments allow unlimited entry in many events.

There seems to be a correlation between the popularity of a tournament and the opportunities for relaxation and social activity it offers. Entertainments, tours, receptions, banquets, and various types of local hospitality are attractive additions to modern tournaments.

Increased ease of travel is making it possible for speakers from constantly expanding areas to find out what other speakers in far away places think about social, economic, and political problems. The tournament is one of the few events which make such a meeting of minds possible.

No doubt absences due to a student's participation in a tournament sometimes result in his receiving a lower grade in a course than he might have obtained if he had attended every class meeting. But the concept of the field trip is predicated on the assumption that a student may learn more outside the classroom than in it. In any case, examination of the grade point average of forensics groups gives me little cause for concern about the ability of the forensics squad to attain very respectable academic standards.

The increasing sizes of audiences in many places is encouraging. In some instances the increase may be attributed to the correlation of the work in speech classes with attendance at tournament events. However, required or recommended attendance is not the only factor at work.

To improve the quality of judging, in many places tournament managers are obtaining qualified judges or adequate appropriations so they may pay the fees for the services of expert judges.

Improved ballots are appearing at many tournaments. At the Eau Claire Interstate Tournament for High Schools, coaches representing 196 teams in Minnesota and Wisconsin voted their preference for adding a "win" factor to team points based on ratings for quality over a mere counting of "won" and "lost."

The student groups who are learning to plan all the infinite details connected with sponsoring a successful speech tournament are developing real executive ability. From the campus of the cadets at West Point west to the shores of California (as the old orators would have put it), students are in charge of tournaments. Such responsibilities help to train leaders, and we need many

more such opportunities for that training.

The well organized and very active American Forensic Association continues to provide a means of exchanging information among coaches. Surely, with such a vigorous group immediately concerned with the improvement of tournaments, I expect to see progress continue.

Although a poll of 158 participants in intercollegiate discussion from thirty-three colleges and universities at the twelfth Eau Claire Speech Meet showed eighty-nine per cent in favor of continuing discussion as a tournament activity, I often hear judges and participants express regret that many speakers who are adequately prepared as debaters do not seem to be equally capable of participating in discussion. If the exchange of opinions at the 1956 convention of the Central States Speech Association in Chicago is any indication of current sentiment, it seems apparent that discussion as a competitive activity is due for a very close scrutiny in the immediate future, and I predict that either the general level of competitive intercollegiate discussion will perceptibly improve, or the activity will lose its place in the present tournament picture.

All this cogitation leads me to some other questions. Has anyone had experience with tournament discussion procedures which we haven't tried out in our territory? Sometimes I even ask myself if discussion should have any place in the interscholastic competitive program.

About two things I don't wonder, however. I'm sure that debate tournaments are better than they used to be. And I'm positive that I'm not at all sure about the status of discussion in the tournament framework of today.

THE FORUM

THE ALEXANDER HAMILTON COMMEMORATIVE SCHOLARSHIPS

Columbia, Missouri
19 December, 1956

To the Editor of *The Speech Teacher*:

Plans for the national competitions for the Alexander Hamilton Commemorative Scholarships in the secondary schools are nearing completion. The Advisory Committee on Contests and Awards of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission (which has been at work for almost a year devising plans for the appropriate observance of the Hamilton Bicentennial) has now approved proposals from forty-eight of the states and territories. Each proposal sets forth the way in which the state or territorial organization plans to select an outstanding student to represent his commonwealth in the American Students Constitutional Convention to be held in Washington during June, 1957. Each student selected will have all expenses paid to attend the Convention to be devoted to study and discussion of the Constitution of the United States.

The proposals vary in form, since the Advisory Committee has left to the organizations in each of the commonwealths the full responsibility of selecting representatives, but one requirement is common to all: Each commonwealth is to select that student whose discourse, as demonstrated in public speaking, discussion, or debate, most nearly exemplifies the closely-reasoned eloquence characteristic of Hamilton's speech-making at its best. The Advisory Committee has also assumed that the selecting agencies will endeavor to choose students whose knowledge of the Constitution and ability to discuss it will enable them to participate effectively in the Constitutional Convention, at which a number of valuable fellowships will be granted to students who excel in this skill.

In addition to the privilege of participating in the Constitutional Convention, every student chosen in each of the states and territories will receive a scholarship. The precise number of fellowships to be granted and the stipend for each scholarship and fellowship will be announced on Alexander Hamilton's birthday, 11 January.

The National Association of Secondary

School Principals has approved the plans for granting the Alexander Hamilton Commemorative Scholarships. In many commonwealths the High School Activities Association or a member of the Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials of the National University Extension Association will sponsor the competitions. The National Forensic League, which has had many years of experience in such enterprises, will actively co-operate in the conducting of the National Convention.

Among the first proposals the Advisory Committee accepted were those of Alaska and Hawaii, who are thus assured of representation.

For particulars, interested students or teachers should address their inquiries to the sponsor in their commonwealth. Commonwealths that have received approval of their proposals and the sponsor in each area, I have listed below. (Once it has completed plans for observing the Bicentennial in the high schools, the Advisory Committee plans to establish a means of observance in the colleges and universities. No announcement of these plans will be forthcoming until 11 January, 1957.)

ALABAMA: T. Earle Johnson, Department of Speech, University of Alabama, University, Alabama.

ALASKA: LeRoy V. Good, Anchorage Community College, Anchorage, Alaska.

ARIZONA: Klonda Lynn, Department of Speech, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.

ARKANSAS: M. Blair Hart, Department of Speech, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas.

CALIFORNIA: Martin P. Andersen, Department of English, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.

COLORADO: Thorrel B. Fest, Colorado State Speech League, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

CONNECTICUT: David C. Phillips, Department of Speech and Drama, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut.

DELAWARE: Gordon C. Godbey, Extension Division, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware.

FLORIDA:
Division
Gainesville
GEORGIA:
Associat
HAWAII:
Univers
IDAHO:
ivities
Idaho.
ILLINOIS:
Associat
Illin
INDIAN:
School
Castle,
IOWA:
Forens
Iowa,
KANSAS:
School
Engla
KENTU
and I
tucky
LOUISI
lation
Bato
MAINE:
Deba
Main
MARY:
of S
Park
MASS:
of I
sach
MICH:
Sch
tion
MINN:
Hip
Mi
MISS:
of
MISS:
Sch
St
MO:
H
U

FLORIDA: Bernice A. Mims, General Extension Division of Florida, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

GEORGIA: S. F. Burke, Georgia High School Association, Box 71, Thomaston, Georgia.

HAWAII: Elizabeth Carr, Department of Speech, University of Hawaii, Honolulu 14, Hawaii.

IDAHO: E. F. Grider, IHS Interscholastic Activities Association, 616 State Street, Boise, Idaho.

ILLINOIS: Albert Willis, Illinois High School Association, 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Illinois.

INDIANA: Juanita Jane Rucker, Indiana High School Forensic Association, High School, New Castle, Indiana.

IOWA: Hugh F. Seabury, Iowa High School Forensic League, The State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

KANSAS: E. A. Thomas, Kansas State High School Activities Association, Room 316, New England Building, Topeka, Kansas.

KENTUCKY: Louis Clifton, College of Adult and Extension Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

LOUISIANA: G. L. Madden, High School Relations Division, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge 3, Louisiana.

MAINE: Brooks Quimby, Bates Interscholastic Debating League, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine.

MARYLAND: W. L. Strausbaugh, Department of Speech, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

MASSACHUSETTS: Austin J. Freeley, Director of Forensics, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN: Alfred W. Storey, Michigan High School Forensic Association, 3501 Administration Building, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

MINNESOTA: H. R. Peterson, Minnesota State High School League, 829 Plymouth Building, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

MISSISSIPPI: Charles M. Getchell, University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi.

MISSOURI: Irvin Keller, Missouri State High School Activities Association, 407 South Sixth Street, Columbia, Missouri.

MONTANA: Ralph Y. McGinnis, Montana High School Speech League, Montana State University, Missoula, Montana.

NEBRASKA: Bruce Kendall, Fine Arts Festival, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: Brooks Quimby, Bates Debating League, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine.

NEW MEXICO: Wayne C. Eubank, Speech Department, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

NEW YORK: Samuel V. O. Pritchard, Jr., New York State High School Forensic League, New York State College for Teachers, Albany, New York.

NORTH CAROLINA: E. R. Rankin, The North Carolina High School Debating Union, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

NORTH DAKOTA: John S. Penn, Department of Speech, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota.

OHIO: Robert E. Dunham, The Ohio High School Speech League, Ohio State University, 205 Derby Hall, Columbus 10, Ohio.

OKLAHOMA: James Robinson, Oklahoma High School Speech League, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.

OREGON: K. E. Montgomery, Oregon High School Speech League, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

(PANAMA) CANAL ZONE: Subert Turbyfill, Division of Schools, Canal Zone Government, (Panama) Canal Zone.

PENNSYLVANIA: Frederick E. Lange, Pennsylvania Forensic and Music League, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania.

RHODE ISLAND: John A. Oostendorp, Rhode Island High School Forensic League, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island.

SOUTH CAROLINA: W. H. Ward, Extension Division, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

SOUTH DAKOTA: Merrill T. Baker, Director of Forensics, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, South Dakota.

TENNESSEE: J. E. Arnold, Tennessee Interscholastic Literary League, University of Tennessee, Box 8540, University Station, Knoxville 16, Tennessee.

TEXAS: R. J. Kidd, University Interscholastic League, University of Texas, Austin 12, Texas.

UTAH: M. C. Golightly, Extension Division, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

VERMONT: Cora Hutchins, Burlington High School, Burlington, Vermont.

VIRGINIA: J. Jeffery Auer, Department of Speech and Drama, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.

VIRGIN ISLANDS: Miss Jane E. Tuit, Department of Education, Government of the Virgin Islands of the United States, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas.

WASHINGTON: George Z. DeBell, Washington State Debate Coaches Association, Pullman, Washington.

WEST VIRGINIA: Lloyd W. Welden, West Virginia Interscholastic Forensic League, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia.

WISCONSIN: Robert H. Schacht, Wisconsin High School Forensic Association, Room 20, Memorial Building, University of Wisconsin, Madison 5, Wisconsin.

WYOMING: W. E. Stevens, Wyoming Speech Association, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming.

BOWER ALY, *Chairman*
Advisory Committee on Contests and Awards,
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission

CONTESTS AND TOURNAMENTS

To the Editor of *The Speech Teacher*:

The recent article by Professor Padrow [Ben Padrow, "Let's Stop Calling Them Educational," *The Speech Teacher*, V (September, 1956), 205-206] is certainly not the first we have seen concerning some of the shortcomings of inter-collegiate forensics, nor is it likely to be the last. One can, in fact, trace these objections back to the earliest publications of the SAA. Yet, despite their long and often honorable lineage, these criticisms have seemed to have little or no effect on forensics generally, a point which the existence of Mr. Padrow's arguments seems to verify.

I suppose that a rather considerable number of American debate coaches will take exception to Padrow's remarks. However, I should like to express one debate coach's "minority opinion"

which holds that if Mr. Padrow is mistaken, his error is one of conservatism, not of liberalism. If anything, I would say that the author understates the case, and, in fact, misses what perhaps the most serious objection to modern forensics: the value system which (by its very nature) it forces on those students who participate in it.

I would suggest that another article in the same issue [Arthur N. Kruger, "The Extempore Speaking Contest," *The Speech Teacher*, V (September, 1956), 214-222] outlines this value system in fairly considerable detail. In the article the author suggests to college debaters that, in an extempore speaking contest, the "good" speaker will "consider an audience first and knowledge second." In other words, make it a performance, as would an actor or an elocutionist. The author goes on to suggest that the speaker choose the unpopular or "liberal" side of a controversial question, "if he has no strong feelings for either side." In other words, think, not of the merits of the question, but of winning. (And one might ask why a speaker should choose sides at all in a controversy about which he has no particular feelings—unless, of course, he makes a thorough study of the problem, something never suggested for debaters).

This writer concludes, "If all other factors are equal, one should choose a subject from his major field of interest." Imagine such a statement in a classroom or in a textbook! Imagine the reaction of other academic departments to the suggestion that, in speech, we teach students to speak on subjects about which they are informed "If all other factors are equal," but only then!

In short, general forensic practice (and the foregoing is general, rather than being a single exception) is directly opposed to current classroom practice, opposed to the ancient heritage of rhetoric, and opposed to all rhetorical desires for honesty and worth in speaking.

Does speech turn out mere "gab artists," glib performers who can speak on any subject—for a price? No, I don't think speech does, but there may be some real question in the case of forensics.

DALE D. DRUM,
Long Beach [California] State College

BOOK REVIEWS

L. LeRoy Cowperthwaite, *Editor*

AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESSES, 1740-1952.

By A. Craig Baird. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1956; pp. xiii+301. \$4.50.

This is the second anthology of American speeches to appear within two years. Both the Parrish-Hochmuth *American Speeches* and this book fill a real need because the good collections Brigrance and O'Neill made for the previous generation of students of public speaking are out of print.

How shall we judge such volumes? Their major purpose (I am not forgetting the brief surveys of speech criticism which introduce both) is to provide students with a collection of significant models of American speaking. I suppose they may be of use both in beginning and advanced public speaking courses and (so far as they go) in the study of the history of American oratory. Obviously, then, we can judge a collection according to the representative cross-section of excellent speeches it contains. To some extent, teachers want to find their favorite models; and since there are far more good speeches than a single volume can contain, the editor must use a great deal of personal discretion.

The second major basis of judgment of an anthology may be the quality of editorship its contents reveal. J. Jeffery Auer and I contributed to "The Forum" in the April, 1940, issue of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* a letter in which we suggested five tests of satisfactory editorship of collections of speeches.

To apply the second basis of judgment first, let me note that Baird has prepared a brief biographical statement about each speaker and a bibliographical note on each speech. In the latter he describes the occasion, the principal sources of the text he uses, and its probable authenticity. When he has not printed the speech in full he indicates omissions. Parrish and Hochmuth followed a similar scholarly practice. Some readers will wish that Baird had abridged with less emphasis on the dramatic concluding section of a few speeches. In Webster's "Reply to Hayne" it is the famous introduction that suffers most in the cutting. In his summation of the Knapp-White trials, the editor fails to cite the notable "raw" text which appeared in the Boston *Evening Transcript*,

which Bradley and Winans treat fully in their *Daniel Webster and the Salem Murder*. Baird does carefully suggest the hybrid nature of the revised, published text.

For advanced students we need collections which present variant texts (from transcriptions, notes, press releases, and author's revisions) printed in parallel columns. And in general I doubt the wisdom of abridging any speech in a collection which students may use in studying patterns of arrangement and the full, free play of a great stylist and debater in such speeches as Webster's "Reply to Hayne" and Borah's address on the Treaty of Versailles.

With respect to the speeches they contain, the Baird and Parrish-Hochmuth books are generally similar. Of the twenty-eight texts in the Parrish-Hochmuth volume and the thirty-eight in the Baird collection, seventeen are the same. The differences in content (in addition to Miss Hochmuth's interesting critique of Lincoln's "First Inaugural") are, I believe, sufficient to justify some attention to both books in advanced courses, though either of them may be ample for elementary acquaintance with some of the best known American speeches. Baird includes speeches by thirteen speakers not represented in the Parrish-Hochmuth collection: Madison, Calhoun, Clay, Douglas, Yancey, Beecher, Beveridge, La Follette, Gompers, Borah, Fossdick, Eisenhower, and Stevenson. Parrish and Hochmuth include speeches by Channing, Jefferson, Curtis, and Schurz, who are not represented in the Baird book. Ten of the latter's additions are the subjects of monographs in the three volumes of *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*. Yet he does not include speeches by Hamilton, Susan B. Anthony, Curtis, Lamar, Moody, Darrow, Parker, Rufus Choate, Black, Evarts, and other speakers who are subjects of *History and Criticism* essays. His use of Eisenhower's first inaugural address and Stevenson's acceptance speech of 1952 are rather obvious bows to a publisher's demand for up-to-dateness.

In addition to its representation of speakers omitted from *American Public Addresses*, *American Speeches* presents texts of different speeches by some of the speakers common to both volumes: Webster's "Bunker Hill Address," Lin-

coln's "Cooper Union" and "Farewell at Springfield," and Phillips' "Toussaint l'Ouverture" instead of the "Murder of Lovejoy." Perhaps Channing's "Unitarian Christianity" is a good alternate to Beecher's "Two Revelations": both are examples of intellectually alert preaching. Many prefer Ingersoll's "Liberty of Man, Woman and Child" to the "Decoration Day" address which Baird chose.

Extending these detailed comparisons and personal preferences would hardly be profitable. Neither volume meets our real need. Although most of the famous speeches they contain are not in any other collections now in print, the texts of the various speeches are readily available in most libraries. About all the compilers have done is to reprint a traditional group of supposedly "greatest" or "famous" speeches. They omit representation of numerous fine speakers studied in the *History and Criticism*, and they show little freshness in their choices of texts from traditionally great speakers. Dozens of dissertations on American speakers and speaking have disclosed eminently able speeches by skillful speakers. In earlier years, editors who sought primarily a high degree of literary quality in what they published overlooked these speeches. Were the choices of editors as far back as Carpenter and Williston, or even Moore, and, much later, Reed, so wise that in the Colonial and Early National periods they should determine our students' basic readings today? What, if any, pressures by publishers tend to restrict the choices of our good scholars who are well aware of so many other rich and rewarding America speeches? Are we about ready for a collection of unfamiliar, but uncommonly good, American speeches?

GEORGE V. BOHMAN,
Wayne University

SPEECH FOR YOU. By Charles Masten and George R. R. Pflaum. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1955; pp. viii+311. \$2.40.

This textbook means exactly what its title says, "Speech for You." The authors emphasize the individual and his development into an effective communicator. In "Begin Here, Please" the authors write, ". . . this book is printed for you, to help you in all your classes, in all your activities in and out of school."

Speech for You will be of interest to any beginning speaker. It is practical, and the casual purchaser can use it without supervision. As a textbook, it is best suited to classes in the junior high school. There are few textbooks in

public speaking for this level, and this one is attractive in format, well organized, and usable.

The illustrations are particularly interesting and they express effectively the intended meaning. They catch the eye, amuse, hold attention and encourage.

The first of the three sections of the book is "Speech Preparation." Here the authors discuss the problems of choosing a subject, gathering materials, organizing and delivering a speech in such a clear and easy manner that those who are making their first approach to the study of speech will feel that the book is written especially for them.

Part II, "Speech Situations," makes up half the book. Emphasis in this section is on group speech, conversation, listening, special types of speeches, oral reports, microphone technique, debate, and parliamentary procedure. There is also a good chapter on the use of visual aids, "Let Me Show You."

Part III, "Interpretative and Dramatic Speech," is so short that it serves merely to introduce the field. At the beginning of each chapter there is a valuable outline, and at the end of each is a "Now It's Your Turn" full of practical suggestions for practice. The introductory remarks in each division are in a refreshing style. They point up the important principles and challenge the reader's attention.

If you are searching for a good junior high school textbook, *Speech for You* you may end your search.

FREDA KENNER,
Messick High School,
Memphis, Tennessee

EFFECTIVE SPEAKING IN BUSINESS. By Alfred D. Huston and Robert A. Sandberg, revised by Jack Mills. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955; pp. xvii+329. \$6.35.

This is a careful revision of a book which first appeared in 1943 and subsequently went through several printings. Like the original, the revision is a textbook for classes with some such title as "Business and Professional Speaking," or the like, or a manual of inspiration and practical help for those working without a teacher. The book will serve either function admirably.

The intent is to "study conversation first [Part I, three chapters, fifty-three pages], apply what we can learn there to the more formal business conference [Part II, eight chapters, 138 pages], and carry over the best qualities of conversation and conference speaking to the

public speech situation [Part III, three chapters, ninety-three pages]." Conversation is the subject of only Chapter III, but its twenty-two pages contain a good discussion of it; Chapter I provides "An Approach to Speech Communication," and Chapter II promotes the "Able Man" philosophy. The section on the "Business Conference," Part II, clearly establishes a basis for developing future public speakers, rather than approaching the matter of conferences from the framework of the great majority of recent publications. The reviser has directed attention to application interviews, to sales conferences, and to expository and persuasive types of conference speaking, instead of considering conference leadership and participation with role-playing, interpersonal relations, and hidden agendas.

Students of public address may wince as they read that the "able man" of this book is directly related to Quintilian's "good man," particularly as they note that the "able man's" qualifications include "impressive appearance," "organizing ability," and "constructive imagination."

Perhaps Professor Mills is indulging in a bit of "promotional rhetoric" when he states that "this revised edition is essentially a streamlined version" of the original. He covers in 293 pages what Huston and Sandberg covered in 284 pages in the 1943 edition. The reviser has, however, rewritten extensive portions of the text; he has retained particularly apt illustrations and model speeches, but he has also introduced many new models and illustrations.

Whether it is more helpful to relegate the exercises and readings for each chapter to an appendix than to have them follow the chapters is a debatable point. Certainly it is desirable to have the twelve pages on parliamentary procedure in the appendix. The addition of a number of good photographs and several pages of cartoons contribute to the attractiveness of the book.

The language of *Effective Speaking in Business* is well-suited to the readers to whom it is addressed. Those seeking advancement in the world of business can study with approval and profit its illustrations, principles, and general point of view on effective speaking.

EARNEST BRANDENBURG,
Washington University

BASIC PUBLIC SPEAKING (2d ed.). By Paul L. Soper. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956; pp. xx+374. \$5.00.

In the first edition of *Basic Public Speaking* the author assured his readers that the book

presented no radical departure from the character of contemporary textbooks for beginning classes in public speaking. He had designed his book, he wrote, to meet current classroom demands, emphasizing speech composition, and arranging its content in the order of assignments. One difference from the content of most textbooks, however, was the second chapter, "The Beginning Speeches," which contained brief suggestions to help the student with his earlier talks before he had read the detail of subsequent chapters.

There is no change in the character or purpose of the second edition. The chief change consists mainly of editing and polishing, with some modification of the chapters on outlining and the use of supporting material. Happily, the author has improved his style in liveliness and readability, an effect he achieves mainly by the addition of illustrative material at the beginnings of many chapters. He has placed increased stress on the sense of communication, we read, with a corresponding decrease of emphasis on mechanics. Despite this statement, in the second chapter the student still reads the advice to listen to his own voice in practice, and to establish eye contact as soon as he appears in front of an audience, advice which in the early stages of learning would seemingly tend to direct the student's thought to the mechanical aspects of performance.

Nevertheless, the book would be highly useful in the course for which it is designed: public speaking, rather than general speech. The author has arranged content well, and wisely limited it to what a student will need in a beginning course. The illustrative material is generous and illuminating. Many examples come from student speeches, and are therefore particularly appropriate. The chapter on outlining the speech is especially effective, containing sound advice on how to use the outline, as well as how to construct it. Appendices on microphone speaking and on group discussion and parliamentary procedure allow the instructor to include these topics in his course if he wishes.

While one might quarrel with some of the details (such as the statement on page 33 that the "successful after-dinner speech is almost always a humorous attack upon some group or class of people"), it would be difficult to quarrel with the book as a whole, for it is a sturdy and sound textbook which is the product of careful workmanship.

JAMES N. HOLM,
Kent State University

PRACTICAL AMERICAN ENGLISH FOR STUDENTS FROM OTHER LANDS, BOOK I. By Herbert Schueler and Harold Lenz. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1956; pp. xiii+261. \$3.25.

This is the first volume of a projected series based on the authors' work in the English Language Institute of Queens College. It is intended for classroom use by adults with little previous knowledge of English. Twenty-two lessons dealing with topics of practical concern to the student offer material for extensive aural-oral practice, in the course of which the structural patterns of American English are demonstrated and a functional vocabulary of some fifteen hundred significant words is utilized.

The authors adroitly and pleasantly reinforce exposition with line drawings. Each of the earlier lessons is based on a text-and-pictures sequence, and throughout the book illustrations serve to explain new words as they appear in the text. A special appendix illustrates foods and their preparation. Essential information on such matters as counting, measuring, and using American currency is neatly salted away in the lessons, as well as good advice on conduct (don't stop up the plumbing; don't jaywalk; get plenty of sleep). Except for including the International Phonetic Alphabet with English key words, the authors do not attempt to deal with problems of pronunciation.

An appendix, "Grammar Explanations," contains twenty-two brief lessons on such essentials as the tenses, prepositions, pronouns, and word order. The explanations are terse, and the authors have kept their use of technical terms to a minimum. Because of the great difficulty of teaching "just a little" grammar, simplification has unavoidably resulted in some inadequacies and inaccuracies of statement. One serious lack is that of adequate reference to common two-word idioms.

This book is particularly adaptable to speech-centered instruction in English as a second language, since each lesson provides material for practice in oral reading, question-and-answer drills, conversation, and simple dramatization. It should not be mistaken for either a self-help manual or a classroom textbook for advanced students. Used with the adult beginners for whom it is intended, it should prove to be a stimulating and efficient aid to teaching.

A. T. CORDRAY,
Michigan State University

GUIDE TO AMERICAN ENGLISH. By L. M. Myers. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955; pp. xiii+433. \$3.25.

The Renaissance grammarian in Browning's poem "Ground at grammar" during his last moments, stammered parts of speech through his death rattle, and

Gave us the doctrine of the enclitic De,
Dead from the waist down.

Probably many generations of students since his time have been inclined to think that the numbness of die hard grammarians is proceeding in the opposite direction. This *Guide to American English*, a spirited and whimsical book, should dispel any lingering traces of the stereotype of the dull grammarian. Certainly the author is neither dull nor dogmatic about grammar. If his coverage is less architectonic than that of his predecessors, Myers is nonetheless aware of their efforts to scale heaven. He offers in their place "a treatment of current grammar, pretty well cleared of eighteenth century metaphysics, but retaining traditional ideas and terms whenever they are still accurate and useful."

The first section of the book, devoted to the relation of language to thinking and to the development of English, should prove very useful to students. In "Seeing through Words" the author attacks the concept of reading as "a matter of recognizing the written symbols." Later he demonstrates more fully that "words have no meaning at all" and explores the several kinds of truth and the uses and limitations of logic. The chapters on reports, inferences, value judgments, and the indirect uses of language are rich in illustrations. Some of them are quite timely, e.g., the concealed directive that those who smoke Marilyn Monroe's brand of cigarettes will be "like" her. A brief history of language paves the way for a defense of standard "American" English and a discussion of areas of usage.

Part Two is a study of grammar. In his preface Myers warns his readers that there is bound to be "some inconsistency between the grammar, which I hope is honestly descriptive, and a number of frankly prescriptive entries in the Index to Usage, especially among those dealing with rhetorical points." This description of his method is accurate. For example, he writes, "There is now a tendency to use plain plurals instead of the possessive plural form in the names of institutions." On another point he parries: "Frequently the choice is completely a matter of taste, but two general tendencies are noticeable." He dismisses the use of pos-

essives before gerunds with the statement that it is "ingenious rather than sound," which he follows with an analysis of the differences between Latin and English participles and gerunds. Teachers who have uttered such "ingenious rather than sound" explanations and whose maps of correctness belie the tendencies toward change in grammar may profit more than their students from a reading of this section.

The third section, on rhetoric, impresses me as the most original and useful part of the book. "Writing to Somebody" is a neat introduction to the chapters on sentence structure, organization, and vocabulary. "Finding a Style" begins with a forthright understanding of the student's confusion about a plethora of textbook rules and a concession that the author's view on style may not be universal. Since I had previously adopted the concept of maps and territories which Myers uses as a goad to mental activity, I found it easy to accept this mild tinge of dogmatism. Urging a student to "get the picture straight" is at least a comparatively fresh approach to style, and may prove more stimulating than the old CUE [coherence, unity, and emphasis] which teachers of English once offered as a formula to neophytes.

There is much to say in favor of this book. It offers a unified approach to the several areas of communication: reading, speaking, and writing. The author centers it on meaningful experiences of the student, from his first grappling with language to the classroom situation of today. There is evidence that the author has advantageously used his experience as a professor at Arizona State College. Above all, Myers is far from unreasonable in the demands he makes on students—unless they object to making their own decisions about usage and to formulating their own styles.

ELEANOR McCANN,
San Francisco State College

HANDBOOK OF SPEECH IMPROVEMENT.

By Charles Kenneth Thomas. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1956; pp. iii+135. \$2.75.

The title of this book quite adequately describes its function: to serve as a handbook for persons who wish to improve their own speech. Teachers of speech improvement and speech therapists will find this manual of exercises a useful adjunct of source materials.

The introduction includes definitions of some phonetic terms and a description of vowels and consonants. In Part II the author in-

troduces each of the consonants with a brief explanation of its articulation and diagrams illustrating the positions of tongue, lips, and soft palate during articulation. In Part III he describes the front, central, and back-rounded vowels and the diphthongs. He lists words and sentences for practice.

The index of phonetic symbols, in approximately alphabetical order, provides a handy reference for the user.

JOHN R. MONTGOMERY,
Kent State University

THE ART OF INTERPRETATIVE SPEECH: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF EFFECTIVE READING (4th ed.). By Charles H. Woolbert and Severina E. Nelson. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956; pp. ix+676. \$4.50.

This book first appeared in 1927. For thirty years it has been popular with students and teachers of oral interpretation. Hence here I shall make no attempt to present an extensive review of its contents per se, because this textbook reflects fundamental principles which are familiar to those of us who are interested in speech and oral interpretation. I can best serve the reader by noting *some* of the revisions that Professor Nelson has made in this fourth edition.

She has faithfully retained the able philosophy of the original writing. The authors' twofold aim is to make the finest literature meaningful to each individual student in terms of his experience and to help him communicate this literature effectively through the mastery of his vocal tools.

Professor Nelson has rewritten Part I, "Fundamental Principles of Interpretation," with a more direct focus on "Interpretation as an Art" and "Control in Interpretation."

Part II, "The Techniques of Impression," she has telescoped from five chapters to two. Specifically, the chapter now entitled "The Author" ("Emotional Setting" in earlier editions) she has expanded. The style seems to be more direct and personal, presenting the character, philosophy, and motivation of the author more completely and interestingly to the student. New selections and authors enhance the text of this section and of other parts of the book.

The chapter which was "Logical Details" in the third edition is now "The Author's Meaning." Here again there is evidence of more functional and interesting introductions to the elements and techniques in understanding the logical and emotional meanings of the author.

In Part III, "The Technique of Expression," emphasis is on the vocal aspects of interpretation, such as quality, force, tempo, pitch, and speech patterns. There are three interesting chapters on "Meaning through Bodily Movement," "Choral Interpretation," and "Radio Interpretation." The current edition retains the content of former editions and enriches it with new selections.

An appendix, "Vocal and Articulatory Exercises," includes numerous drills and exercises for the student who needs work in this area. This help was not lacking in the third edition, but in the current one it is amplified and more accessible to the student. These constitute the major revisions.

As for the format of the book, I consider the current edition a great improvement over its predecessors. The print appears to be bolder and less crowded on the page. The subdivisions are more attractive and their spacing is more interesting. And, last, but not least, there is more appeal to the eye in the book's blue cover and its modern design.

A minor criticism I have had of the previous editions is that the authors introduced a selection to the student too quickly, without necessary background or cues for comprehensive and further study. Severina Nelson has done much to dissipate that criticism. Many thanks to her for a teachable, sound, and worthwhile revision. Teachers of speech will be happy to meet or renew acquaintance with this honorable friend, *The Art of Interpretative Speech*.

L. LAMONT OKEY,
University of Michigan

HELPING THE BIBLE SPEAK: HOW TO READ THE BIBLE ALOUD MORE EFFECTIVELY. By Johnnye Akin, Seth A. Fessenden, P. Merville Larson, and Albert N. Williams. New York: Association Press, 1956; pp. 117. \$2.50.

Those of us who teach courses in oral reading of the Bible are always on the lookout for possible textbooks and supplementary readings for our classes. While the authors did not apparently intend *Helping the Bible Speak* as a classroom textbook, teachers and students will find it an interesting and helpful little volume.

The emphasis is on sincere reverence and purpose in oral reading of the Bible, manifesting itself in a careful study of the text and the use of common-sense techniques of oral interpretation. The authors make a pointed distinction between the suggestion of the reader and the abandon of the actor.

In my opinion, the most significant sections of the book are those in which the authors discuss the form of Biblical poetry and the reader's purpose. The passages they have selected to illustrate the various techniques are well chosen, but limited in number.

In the opening paragraph of the first chapter the authors ask, "Is reading the Bible aloud a different process from reading other books aloud? the essays of Emerson, for instance? the sonnets or the plays of Shakespeare? the great documents of our historical heritage, such as the Declaration of Independence?" They answer that question in the affirmative, and base the supposed difference on the concept that "In its original form, the Bible was never meant to be a book for silent and meditative reading. The sole purpose—originally—of committing the Scriptures to writing was to preserve them so that later generations could read them aloud."

They amplify this thesis at great length, and eventually assert, ". . . every passage in the Bible was originally spoken in the heat of action." The authors would be hard pressed to establish their all-inclusive oral concept of the Scriptures; but even if it were true, could we not say the same of a great body of non-Biblical literature? And does this oral nature of the Bible require reading it aloud to be "a different process from reading other books aloud"?

One turns with interest to the chapters on technique to discover the elements of difference. But in those chapters the authors lay out and illustrate a traditional pattern of techniques of preparation and reading techniques. The reader is to study the material in terms of its setting, its mood, its purpose, its ideas and language, and is to phrase it according to its meaning. Reading techniques include control of tone quality, of pitch (including accent and stress), and of volume and projection as bases of communicating both meaning and emotion: the sense of the passage determines the control of rate and rhythm (including phrasing and pausing); imagery and emotional control are the reader's final bridge to his audience.

The first three and a half chapters, in which the authors discuss the nature and purpose of Biblical literature, are needlessly involved in knotty and debatable questions of Biblical criticism, in which propositions are more assumed than proved. I believe abridgement would have improved this section.

In discussing the unity of the Bible theme, the authors picture it as a great dramatic poem in three acts: Act I begins with the exodus from

Egypt and
salem by
with the
the prop
Act III
Baptist
of Chris
is the p
Revelati
would s
the four
timate
lined"
least in
is on t
the first
phasis,
tremely
the Bi
special
examp
The
cernin
in the
Bible
stimul
to the
more

FOR
By
Pre
Jol
liver
Colle
ries
ling
acro
his
over
atre
tury
T
sect
he
art
ism
ric
au
po
ph
cri
G
ex

Egypt and ends with the destruction of Jerusalem by the armies of Babylon. Act II opens with the dark days of exile and closes with the prophetic longing for a new and better day. Act III opens with the preaching of John the Baptist, and its final scene is the resurrection of Christ. According to this analysis, Genesis is the prologue to the drama, and Acts through Revelation, the epilogue. There are those who would suggest that these books really comprise the fourth and final act of the drama: the ultimate fulfillment of the "hopes and desires outlined" in Act I. But this three-act analysis at least indicates that the emphasis of the book is on the reading of the Old Testament and the first four books of the New. And this emphasis, together with the idea that "with extremely few exceptions . . . the original form of the Bible was poetry" leaves no room for special consideration of other literary forms, for example, the narrative and the didactic.

Therefore, I raise some sincere questions concerning certain concepts the authors suggest in the introductory chapters of *Helping the Bible Speak*, but I am grateful to them for the stimulation their little book will surely bring to those who desire "to read the Bible aloud more effectively."

FRED J. BARTON,
Abilene Christian College

FORM AND IDEA IN MODERN THEATRE.

By John Gassner. New York: The Dryden Press, 1956; pp. xiv+290. \$4.50.

John Gassner originally prepared and delivered the substance of this book at Alabama College in November, 1953, as the seventh series of Dancy Lectures. Newly appointed Sterling Professor of Playwriting at Yale, he "roams across considerable space as well as time" in his attempt to provide the reader with an overview of developments in drama and theatre since the rise of realism in the past century.

The author has divided the book into five sections. In the first, "The Realistic Phase," he examines the "modernization" of dramatic art. Next he surveys the transition "From Realism to Expressionism." This leads to "Theatricalism and Crisis." In the fourth section the author draws together his arguments in support of a "realist-theatricalist synthesis" in playwriting and production, a style that other critics have termed "poetic realism," although Gassner does not use the expression.

Each of the first three sections contains an extended discussion to which are appended

shorter "observations" on different aspects of the particular subject under consideration. Among the provocative "observations" are brief notes on "Shaw and Realism," "Stage Architecture and the Play," "Verse and Verse-Realism," and a most interesting account of "Meyerhold's War Against Realism."

The fifth and final section of the book is a valuable thirty-page chronology of significant events in theatrical history from 1486 (the discovery of Vitruvius' Latin treatise, *De architectura*) to 1950 (the opening at the Hotel Edison of the first arena theatre in the Broadway area). This chronology shows how persistent, how continuous, has been the "striving after new forms of dramatic art."

The author defines "form" in his title to mean "the distinctive structure of a play and the distinctive texture of the writing—that is, the style in which it is written." By "idea" Gassner means "the view of theatre apparent in the play or the production (or in both), and the special esthetic aim pursued in the work aside from the general one of interesting, entertaining, or stirring an audience. . . . I use the term to denote some specific way of conceiving the nature and use of theatre."

He maintains that the realistic "form" was the result of certain "ideas," three of them being freedom of dramatic form, illusionism, and environment. The two other "ideas," simplification and the illusion of unreality, led the way to the non-realistic forms of symbolism, epic dramaturgy and production, expressionism, and the other *ism's* of theatricality. The upshot of the "war of the *ism's*" is that the present-day theatre has reached a crisis, in Gassner's view. Which road to the future shall the theatre take? Not the road of "humdrum realism," nor the road of "theatre-for-theatre's sake." Gassner tells us that the way out of the contemporary impasse is down the road of a "theatricalist-realist synthesis," a road which offers "a suitable mediation between *immediacy* and *universality*," a skillful blending of the real and the ideal.

This is a highly theoretical book which will please neither the confirmed realist nor the confirmed theatricalist. I personally dislike Gassner's loose use of "realism," which he sometimes uses so broadly as to forfeit discriminatory value. But he wants the realists and the theatricalists to declare a truce, to join hands, for he finds it

"... imperative to resolve, once and for all, the conflicts between realism and theatricalism."

Realism without theatrical intensification generally has proved dull. And theatricality without a realistic foundation frequently has proved trivial. But a judicious fusing of the potentialities of both modes of theatre may legitimately arouse the highest expectations."

This book deserves the attention of everyone interested in theories of drama and theatre. It should find a place on the bookshelf beside the works of Mordecai Gorelik, Stark Young, Francis Fergusson, and Eric Bentley.

BEDFORD THURMAN,
Kent State University

YOUR TAPE RECORDER. By Robert and Mary B. Marshall. New York: Greenberg: Publisher, 1955; pp. x+278. \$4.95.

The authors have written this book for teachers, ministers, students, and, in fact, all non-technically-trained persons who use tape recorders. Recognizing the misgivings of this group when they confront electrical apparatus, the authors devote approximately half their book to a rather simple explanation of the

components, operation, and specifications of tape recorders. They include in this section a chapter on recording and editing techniques.

The second half of the book they devote to applied tape recording. This section consists mainly of suggested uses in various fields and their applications. Here the authors also present illustrations of a number of tape recorders with a brief summary of their specifications.

In writing this book the Marshalls faced a difficult decision. If they developed their material in depth, the book would be too "technical" for their intended audience. If they simplified and condensed the material, the book would be superficial. I believe they elected the latter alternative.

This is not a book for professional users of tape recorders. However, it will prove valuable for the audience to whom the authors address it, for it contains much useful information and many helpful suggestions for the incipient tape worm.

R. S. BRUBAKER,
Pennsylvania State University

BOBBITT,
Journal of
University

This is
the edu
health.
they pe
in whi
resortin
thor b
reducin
supply
availab
problem

CROSS,
a Su
can
(May
Listi
perior
the b
the st
school
comm
the v
emph
both

MILL
Sci
42-
Th
unde
reme
serts
mak
able
but
gent

BAR
A
r
7
thr

IN THE PERIODICALS

Annetta L. Wood, *Editor*

Assisted by Carol Brinser, Dale D. Drum, and Marie Orr Shere

GENERAL

BOBBITT, JOSEPH M. "Mental Health Programs," *Journal of the American Association of University Women*, XLIX (May, 1956), 207-210.

This article (excerpted from a speech) stresses the educational problems of workers in mental health. Helping people to change in the way they perceive their own problems and the way in which they perceive themselves, without resorting to direct clinical intervention, the author believes, would be a great step toward reducing mental illness so that the present supply of psychological and psychiatric help available would be sufficient to cope with the problem.

CROSS, ROSAMOND. "The Basic Requirement of a Superior Education," *Journal of the American Association of University Women*, XLIX (May, 1956), 218, 220-221.

Listing as the first requirement of a superior education the *mastery* of the "three R's," the basic tools of learning, and the second as the steady growth of competence in whatever school work is to be done, the author considers communication the third requirement: "... from the very first grade of school there must be emphasis on correct and accurate expression, both oral and written."

MILLER, GEORGE A. "Information and Memory," *Scientific American*, CXCIV, 2 (August, 1956), 42-46.

The author first demonstrates in simple, understandable terms that "our capacity to remember limits our intelligence," and then asserts that "We should try to organize material to make the most efficient use of the memory available to us." This conclusion is scarcely startling, but his explanation of what constitutes intelligent organization may prove to be of value.

PUBLIC SPEAKING

BARRETT, LAWRENCE A. "What's the Name?" *American Mercury*, LXXXIII, 390 (July, 1956), 82-84.

The public speaker may adopt the author's three simple rules for remembering names and

recalling facts which slip away under the stress of public speaking. Students of psychology will recognize the rules as the laws of learning.

SCHMIDT, RALPH N. "Don't Apologize!" *The Sample Case*, CV, 10 (October, 1956), 7, 14.

The words of Lew Sarett can best express the thinking upon which this article is based: "Don't apologize! If you have anything for which to apologize, the audience will find it out soon enough. If they don't find it out, then you have nothing for which to apologize."

———. "Don't Sell Yourself Short!" *The Sample Case*, CV, 9 (September, 1956), unnumbered.

Most people fail to realize that they have something to say; most people want to be able to address an audience, but they fear that the preparation and delivery of a speech of interest to an audience demands too much work. The speaker who heeds the admonition of the title is the one who knows that it is easier to talk about ideas which interest him than it is to try to find a subject in which his audience already has an interest.

———. "Terminal Facilities," *The Sample Case*, CV, 6 (June, 1956), 11.

Any speaker can obtain "terminal facilities" (the how and when of concluding a speech) by following these rules: "First, recognize that you have need of them. Second, know exactly what you want your audience to do about your speech. Third, work out a transition from your development of the subject to your conclusion—and fix it firmly in your memory."

DRAMATICS AND ORAL INTERPRETATION

BENTON, WILLIAM. "Report from Russia: Bolshoi Ballet School," *Theatre Arts*, XL, 3 (March, 1956), 83-84, 88-89.

The Bolshoi Ballet Company of two hundred, the world's largest, annually selects for training only thirty of the five hundred ten-year-old applicants. Ballet in Russia (as in England and France) is subsidized, and helps to build a mecca for lovers of one of the arts.

CLURMAN, HAROLD. "Theatre," *The Nation*, CLXXXII (21 January, 1956), 58.

The Lunts are among the last of our remaining eminent elder actors. Young actors today, after they have played one or two leading roles on Broadway, go into the glowing mediocrity of films or television. An actor negates himself as an artist if he equates his success with financial returns rather than with maturity.

DAVIES, ROBERTSON. "The Genius of Dr. Guthrie," *Theatre Arts*, XL, 3 (March, 1956), 28-30, 90.

The author claims that the influence of the dynamic, creative, fifty-six-year-old director, Tyrone Guthrie, extends far beyond his personal work, and that he has done more than any other man living to clarify, de-sentimentalize, and accelerate the production of classic plays.

FREEMAN, MICHAEL. "Marcel Marceau: Human Comedy Artist," *Senior Scholastic*, LXVIII, 15 (17 May, 1956), 12.

A high school student demonstrates in his honorable-mention-winning essay that the art of pantomime has a timeless and ageless appeal of great depth.

HAMILTON, GLADYS. "Untold Tales of Eugene O'Neill," *Theatre Arts*, XL, 8 (August, 1956), 31-32, 88.

The widow of the drama critic, Clayton Hamilton, gives a moving picture of the struggles of a beginning playwright. Her materials are hitherto unpublished letters which passed between her husband and the Nobel Prize dramatist. Students may find encouragement in the knowledge that even such a genius as O'Neill had to fight for recognition.

WATKINS, VERNON. "Dylan Thomas: Elegy," *The Atlantic Monthly*, CXCVII, 6 (June, 1956), 42-43.

Mr. Watkins' notes on this unfinished poem by Dylan Thomas supply interesting insight into the poet's method of composition.

WESTMORE, WALLY and MARTIN, PETE. "I Make Up Hollywood," *The Saturday Evening Post*, CCIX, 5 (4 August, 1956), 17-19, 78-81; 6 (11 August, 1956), 30, 83-85.

The second part of this article is of especial interest to actors and directors. Of particular value are the photographs of Frederic March made up for *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and Barbara Stanwyck (then thirty-four) in the role of a seventy-five-year-old woman in *The Great Man's Lady*.

WINGFIELD, SAM G. "Yesterday's Minstrels," *The American Mercury*, LXXXIII, 392 (September, 1956), 43-47.

Dan Emmet is credited with originating the minstrel show in 1843. In this amusing history you may learn about the years between 1843 and the 1920's, when the American minstrel show died out.

SPEECH CORRECTION

KING, HERBERT. "I Lost my Voice to Cancer," *The Saturday Evening Post*, CCIX, 9 (1 September, 1956), 20, 71-73.

The Adult Division of the San Francisco schools offers the only public school speech class for "laryngectomees," but it is only one of many classes throughout the United States which serve to rehabilitate the forty thousand persons who must learn esophageal speech.

LARSON, ARTHUR. "Mending Damaged Voices," *The American Mercury*, LXXXII, 389 (June, 1956), 125-130.

In this history of James S. Greene's establishment of what is now the National Hospital for Speech Disorders the author includes a popular discussion of speech therapy. The speech correctionist may find this article a help in his doctrinating laymen with the function and value of speech therapy.

McHUGH, ROBERT P. "The Last Days of Menck," *The American Mercury*, LXXXIII, 392 (July, 1956), 17-20.

The formerly highly articulate author and editor, Henry L. Mencken, had to bear the cross of semantic aphasia during the last years of his life. This chatty account of visits with the stricken titan provides insight into the problems which the aphastic faces.

PASAMANICK, BENJAMIN, CONSTANTINON, FRANCES, and LILIENFELD, ABRAHAM. "Pregnancy Experience and the Development of Childhood Speech Disorders," *The Journal of Pediatrics*, XC (February, 1956), 115-117.

The prenatal and paranatal records of 40 children with disorders of speech not associated with cerebral palsy or mental deficiency showed no more complications of pregnancy and delivery than did the records of a similar number of matched controls. This finding appears to eliminate brain injury in the pre- and paranatal periods as an important etiological factor in speech defects.

VAN DELLEN, THEODORE R. "Clews to Deafness," *Better Hearing*, I, 2 (Autumn, 1956), p. 11.

In this article reprinted from *The Chicago Tribune* the author states that the majority of hearing defects in children can be cured or arrested if they are detected early. He points out behavior patterns of the child which should cause parents to suspect hearing loss.

WHITMAN, ARMITAGE. "Silence or Death," *The American Mercury*, LXXXIII, 390 (July, 1956), 49-54.

"Speechlessness is worse than the most horrible imagination," writes a surgeon in whom calcium deposits after a laryngectomy so constricted the breath passage that it was impossible to develop esophageal speech. An electro-larynx proved to be an adequate solution to the problem.

MOTION PICTURES AND TELEVISION

BAUM, FRANK. "The Oz Film Co.," *Films in Review*, VII (August-September, 1956), 329-333.

In the winter of 1913-1914, L. Frank Baum, then at the height of his fame, with a number of other well-known men formed The Oz Film Manufacturing Company, Inc., which had exclusive film rights to Baum's "Oz" books. After five unsuccessful films, the company went out of existence. Not until Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer produced *The Wizard of Oz* was anyone able to accomplish what Baum himself could not do: make his Oz stories as interesting to adults as they are to children.

GRAY, HUGH. "When in Rome . . ." (Part II), *The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television*, X (Summer, 1956), 344-353.

One of the three Americans whose names appear among the seven writing credits for *Ulysses* describes the shooting of that film in Rome and its environs. Of especial interest are his remarks concerning the differences between the Latin and the Anglo-Saxon concepts of the dramatic moment and the difficulties in writing effective dialogue in any one language for the "dubbing" of a polyglot film.

GREEN, STANLEY. "Richard Rodgers Filmusic," *Films in Review*, VII (October, 1956), 398-405, 420.

Beginning with Rodgers' introduction to the writing of music for motion pictures, the score for *America's Sweetheart* of 1931, the author traces his compositions from those for *Love Me Tonight* through *Oklahoma!*, *Carousel*, and *The King and I*. In spite of Rodgers' fame and

the fact that he has composed some of the finest music for the sound track, many of his airs have ended on the cutting room floor. The emphasis is on Rodgers' three most recent hits and his music for *Victory at Sea*.

KOVAL, FRANCIS. "Venice 1956," *Films in Review*, VII (October, 1956), 369-374.

"Ever since World War II, . . . the tendency toward ever greater commercialization had led to quantity replacing quality, . . ." Koval hoped that in 1956 the Venice Film Festival would again be a genuine art festival, in accordance with its sponsoring committee's announcement to that effect. Presentation of a film at the Festival was to be a genuine honor; commercial "advertisements" for a country were not to be eligible. (Great Britain and America reacted to this announcement by withdrawing their entries.) It is disappointing to note that the Festival did not approach its pre-World War II excellence; the Grand Prix was not awarded last year.

MEAD, GORDON R. "Czechoslovakia's Film Festival," *Films in Review*, VII (October, 1956), 384-393.

In diary form the author reports his impressions of the ninth international film festival at Carlsbad. Although emphasis was on films from communist countries, seven non-satellite nations were represented: Norway, England, France, Italy, Greece, India, and Japan. For the most part, the films were undistinguished. One comment is particularly poignant: "A little Hungarian comedy this morning indicated once more that at least Hungary can make films which do not deal ponderously with 'the movement of national liberation.'" Surprisingly, only six of the twenty-one awards went to communist films.

MINER, EARL ROY. "Japanese Film Art in Modern Dress," *The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television*, X (Summer, 1956), 354-363.

Mr. Miner presents critical and expository notes on five Japanese films on contemporary themes (as contrasted with the historical pagantry of *Rashomon*, *Ugetsu*, and *Gate of Hell*, for example). "There are no doubt many Japanese films that, whatever their quality, are culturally too alien to be understood by even the more favorably disposed American audiences; but it is now possible to say with assurance that Japanese film art is not only artistically equal to the work of any country, but also that it is truly international in its universal human appeal."

NICHOLS, LELAND L. "TV Opens the Screen to New Playwrights," *The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television*, X (Summer, 1956), 337-343.

The author supplies some enlightening (and disheartening) facts about Hollywood's purchase of screen rights to television plays. Teachers and students of playwriting will be disappointed that "new playwrights" refers here to playwrights new to the screen, and not to those just beginning to ply their craft. "Blanche Gaines, a leading TV literary agent . . . agrees that the number of newcomers' scripts worthy of consideration is limited. 'I don't know how a new writer can get started in television,' she says, and adds that an out-of-town writer is at a particular disadvantage since he is not available for story conferences even if his script is read and considered."

PAULU, BURTON. "Britain's Independent Television Authority," *The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television*, X (Summer, 1956), 325-336.

This excerpt from a forthcoming book (*British Broadcasting*) is an objective account of "commercial" television in the British Isles. There are implications here for American broadcasting: "In theory, therefore, the British ITA is not commercial television American-style, in which sponsors often provide the programs for which they pay, but rather follows the pattern of the press, editorial content and advertising being sharply separated."

SMITH, FRANK LEON. "The Man who Made Serials," *Films in Review*, VII (October, 1956), 375-383.

Beginning with his jaunty appearance at the Pathé office in 1913, George Brackett Seitz ". . . proved to be one of the motion picture industry's most active and profitable practitioners." He began by writing more than a script a week, producing twelve films in three years, and, in all, producing some hundred serials and feature films in his career. In the 1920's, serials were the object of more serious consideration than they are today: they had bigger budgets and better stars, and even critics deigned to notice some of them. Unlike many of his contemporaries, Seitz was able to change with the times. When sound came to the screen, he left

serials to produce such well-known films as "Andy Hardy" series and *Yellow Jack*.

SPEARS, JACK. "Comic Strips on the Screen," *Films in Review*, VII (August-September, 1956), 317-325, 333.

"The movies and the newspaper comic strip had their beginnings at approximately the same time and place." With this introduction, Spears follows the parallel developments and interferences of these two media in a fascinating historical account of the use which films have made of comic strip characters. Sound added a new dimension to the "strips," and *Skippy*, based on the Percy Crosby comic, received excellent critical notices. In recent years, the comic strip which has not found its way to the motion picture or television screen is the rule, not the exception.

SPRINGER, JOHN. "Westhampton's Film Festival," *Films in Review*, VII (August-September, 1956), 305-308.

The Westhampton of the title is not in England, but on Long Island, the scene of the first Cavalcade of Film Classics on 21, 22, and 23 June, 1956, a benefit exhibition for a proposed Motion Picture Hall of Fame in Hollywood. Chosen as the first to be honored for inclusion in this Hall of Fame were Mary Pickford, D. W. Griffith, Cecil B. DeMille, Douglas Fairbanks, and Charles Chaplin. Unfortunately, the income from the Cavalcade just equalled its expenses, but a five-thousand-dollar donation "saved the day," and plans for the building have begun.

WALD, JERRY. "Sex in Movies," *Films in Review*, VII (August-September, 1956), 309-311.

A famous Hollywood producer thoroughly analyzes sex as it has appeared on American screens during the past fifty-odd years, concluding that the movies do not so much make a mirror our sexual mores.

AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS

"Quick Facts on Magnetic Tape Recorders," *Audio Record*, XII, 3 (September-October, 1956), 2-17.

This annual summary of specifications continues to be the best guide for the prospective purchaser of a tape recorder.

AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS

Jon Hopkins, *Editor*

FILMS

JUST WHAT IS GENERAL SEMANTICS?
NET Film Service, Audio-Visual Center, Indiana University, 1956. 30 minutes. Sound. Black and white. Sale: \$100. Rental: Apply.

After a brief introduction by an off-stage voice, the late Irving J. Lee quickly comes to a statement of what he hopes to explore with his audience in "Talking Sense," a series of six thirty-minute television programs: "the things that happen when people talk together that lead to misunderstanding, tension, and conflict." To illustrate these three, he quotes Gertrude Stein, a letter to an editor, and an ambassador's account of a propaganda "twist." He then enlarges his frame of reference to demonstrate that man's acquisition of knowledge is not enough to guarantee progress: because men can (and do) ignore what is already known.

This ignoring leads Professor Lee to mention Alfred Korzybski's approach: to search for the common body of knowledge or essence of wisdom, acceptable to specialists in all fields, from which we might build a system of determining intelligent behavior for all children and adults.

The starting point he proposes is the immediate "evaluation" of any event or happening which results in an impact on the nervous system. Then Lee says that this evaluation determines how we talk or act (or both) in response. The crux of the problem, then, is to train ourselves to distinguish between "intelligent" and "unintelligent, or impractical" evaluations. Recognition of an evaluation as unintelligent should cause us to reject it and thus avoid the behavior it suggests. He quotes several examples from psychological research to emphasize how unintelligent human evaluations can be.

The major difference between man and other animals, says Lee, is the former's ability to symbolize. As a result, the individual can make progress by building on the experiences of his predecessors, rather than repeating their trials and errors. Why, then, he asks, does man sometimes fail to make progress?

Professor Lee uses the closing minute of his presentation to arouse curiosity about his next

lecture. He presents an apple, assures his viewers that it is an ordinary apple in every respect, and says, "Suppose you say that there are seeds in this apple. Are you talking factually? If this is not a statement of fact, what is it?"

Professor Lee obviously covers a great deal of ground in the twenty-seven minutes he is before the camera, and at times his rate of delivery is too rapid for comfort. His friendly charm, his use of emphasis and reiteration, and his obvious confidence in General Semantics as an approach to a saner world will, I believe, carry faltering listeners over the rough spots.

THURSTON M. REEVES,

The Pennsylvania State University

DO YOU KNOW HOW TO MAKE A STATEMENT OF FACT? NET Film Service, Audio-Visual Center, Indiana University, 1956. 30 minutes. Sound. Black and white. Sale: \$100. Rental: Apply.

This is the second film in the series, "Talking Sense." This series has one outstanding characteristic which should recommend it to all those concerned with communication: Professor Lee was an excellent speaker and a distinguished scholar, and his effectiveness loses very little in the film medium.

His examples in this film (as always) are vivid and hold the attention. His three key illustrations relating to factual statements ("Are there seeds in an apple?" "Where did the coin [in a parlor trick] go?" and "How did the fingerprints [in a famous Scotland Yard case] get on the wall?") serve well to introduce the viewer to the scope of the discipline of General Semantics.

The creation of the illusion of a classroom lecture situation throughout the film is so effective that the student often flounders in a rush of confused reactions when the lights come up at the end of half an hour. This reaction results especially in connection with the General Semantics definition of "fact," which may seem to be contrary to the generally-accepted meaning of the word.

Dr. Lee's film lecture performs a valuable service in awakening the viewer to the true nature of "facts," but disillusionment may fol-

low this awakening as the student tries to apply to the world about him the principles he has just learned.

At this point in his classes, Professor Lee used to proceed into class discussion, showing his students how to resolve these confusions. The instructor who shows this film must provide opportunity for discussion to reconcile the conflicting thoughts which must arise in the mind of the discerning student. Such discussion seems to be not a desirable, but a necessary, part of showing this film.

Assuming that properly-guided discussion follows it, this film provides a unique opportunity for high school and college students and adult education groups to hear one of the most articulate scholars in the field explain a principle of General Semantics.

KENNETH D. BRYSON,
Montana State College

WHY DO PEOPLE MISUNDERSTAND EACH OTHER? NET Film Service, Audio-Visual Center, Indiana University, 1956. 30 minutes. Sound. Black and white. Sale: \$100. Rental: Apply.

In the third program in the "Talking Sense" series, Professor Lee says that in response to a speaker's jargon the wise listener says to himself, "What is he trying to say?" We need a flexible attitude in language. In other words, the listener should concern himself not only with what the speaker's *words* mean, but also with what the *speaker* means. Professor Lee illustrates the confusions which often result from failing to consider this difference.

Lee devotes considerable time to pointing out what we know about words: There are technical and non-technical words; in the meanings of words there are enormous regional variations; the meanings of words change historically; there is continuous coinage of new words; and we know how to make differences in tone which affect meanings. He uses many examples to make each of these points clear.

The main reason for people's misunderstanding each other in the two-way process of communication is that listeners assume that speakers use words as they (the listeners) would use them.

This film should be helpful in studying language usage in advanced high school classes or in college classes in the fundamentals of speech. The lecture format would hardly be appealing to younger students.

THOMAS R. McMANUS,
Kent State University

WHAT IS A GOOD OBSERVER? NET Film Service, Audio-Visual Center, Indiana University, 1956. 30 minutes. Sound. Black and white. Sale: \$100. Rental: Apply.

In this fourth film in the "Talking Sense" series Professor Lee continues to utilize an inductive organization in leading to his main points, citing examples and using visual aids to clarify ideas as he proceeds. In this lecture he summarizes man's approach to recognizing the differences and similarities of designs. He reaches the conclusion that no two entities are exactly alike in all respects and, therefore, no two objects can be exactly alike to every person. For the learning process it is valuable to discern similarities, but the person who can distinguish differences as well is capable of sophistication in the sense of being one who bears a mark of distinction. Thus, Lee generalizes, one who can discern both similarities and differences is a mature person.

Lee shows us that we tend to base our talk on ideas we have gained from observation. He uses charts to illustrate the distinctions between good and poor observers. He makes the point that the poor observer draws his conclusions from only some item statements, and so reaches his results with limitations. The good observer, however, notices other possibilities. The poor observer thinks in terms of similarities observed in a limited observation. The good observer notes differences as well. Comparison of American Indian and English vocabularies shows that in the one language different words for one object reveal the tendency to think in terms of differences, whereas the all-inclusive words of English are evidence of our emphasis on similarities. Lee states that "man finds it as easy to talk in similarities as to point out the differences." Thus, since schooling in the area of similarities leads one to see less, we should place more stress on the area of observing the differences.

This film would be of practical use in a class in General Semantics or in a class in communication or public speaking when the students are studying how to gather material through good observation.

JANET G. SMITH,
University of Maryland

ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WORDS AND THINGS. NET Film Service, Audio-Visual Center, Indiana University, 1956. 30 minutes. Sound. Black and white. Sale: \$100. Rental: Apply.

"Suppose I were to throw this to you. After

you caught it, suppose I asked you what I had thrown. You would answer, as many others have, 'A piece of chalk!' Would it surprise you to learn that I had not thrown 'a piece of chalk'? I threw *this*." (He holds the chalk for all to see). Professor Lee's point is that he threw an object, not a series of words: the words merely represent the object.

Professor Lee illustrates this concept by quoting the familiar passage from Helen Keller's autobiography concerning her first insight (at the age of seven) into the fact that "water" (the word) is a symbol people use to represent the cool liquid she had felt so often on her hands.

After the introduction, the discussion narrows to the difficulties people get themselves into by exaggeration, by a failure to be precise and accurate. Professor Lee devotes a major portion of the film to amplification of that concept. The evidence consists in specific instances, most of which come from Professor Lee's personal experience.

He gives an account of a dinner party during which the guests thoroughly enjoyed the food and the social period following the dining until they heard the host's announcement that the cold meat they had eaten from a silver dish was neither pork nor chicken, but snake. One young lady turned ashen and vomited. Lee concludes that the dramatic and violent gastric reaction was not to the snake meat itself, but to the words and the connotations they had for her.

Wendell Willkie's biography is the source of a good example of oversimplification. To say, "Wendell Willkie believed in One World" is to imply that he believed in One World all-the-time. In truth, he did not. Similar is an experience Professor Lee had with the student advisee who came to him feeling that he should withdraw from the university because "I am a failure." Lee asked him, "When?" The young man realized that he had upset himself very much by exaggerating one or two specific failures into "I am an all-the-time-failure."

Other interesting specific instances further amplify the central thesis that when we think only of the words we use and overlook the objects the words represent we can cause ourselves serious trouble.

This film is appropriate to junior high school, high school, and college classes as a supplement to any unit on language usage.

JON HOPKINS,
Eastern Illinois State College

THE MAN WHO KNOWS IT ALL. NET Film Service, Audio-Visual Center, Indiana University, 1956. 30 minutes. Sound. Black and white. Sale: \$100. Rental: Apply.

This final lecture of "Talking Sense" focuses attention on the undesirable consequences of "allness" thinking. After demonstrating the impossibility of any one person's knowing and discussing all there is to know about any one subject, Professor Lee points out the barriers to learning, the arrogance and bigotry, the lack of communication, and the damaged human relations which can result from functioning as if one had complete and final knowledge of a topic.

Professor Lee labors too long his example of "the apple" to illustrate the infinite possibilities of a relatively simple subject. The many references to literature which exemplify the fallacies inherent in "allness" thinking are interesting, but more convincing are the examples Professor Lee draws from his own experience in teaching policemen and his research with students who evidenced difficulties in reading. More real and less fictional evidence would make the film more convincing.

Lack of clear focus and recording in the early part of the film reduces its effectiveness. Also distracting is Professor Lee's monotony of rate and his failure to pause. He hurries over quoted material to the point that the viewer loses its significance. Watching Professor Lee shuffle his notes after his lecture is not an effective conclusion to the film. However, the absence of Hollywood musical fanfare and dramatic episodes, the straightforward presentation of the basic idea, is refreshing. In spite of its slight technical defects in photography and production, the film is a clear presentation of the fallacies of "allness" thinking, one of the basic themes of General Semantics.

CARL A. DALLINGER,
State University of Iowa

THE BULLETIN BOARD

Waldo Phelps, *Editor*
Assisted by Ordean Ness

ADDITIONS: NEW COURSES, CURRICULA, FACILITIES, AND FACULTIES

New members of the speech staff at Adelphi College are Clark S. Marlbor and Robert L. Hilliard, assistant professors, and Leola S. Horowitz, associate professor and Director of the Speech and Hearing Center.

John B. Ellery has joined the speech faculty of Alabama College.

In its one-hundred-sixteenth year, Bethany [West Virginia] College has established a Department of Speech and Drama. Previous to this year, the Department of English has offered all the courses in these two fields. Robert Clyde Yarborough of the Bethany faculty has been promoted to full professorship and is serving as the head of the new department.

Eldon Elder is a new Assistant Professor of Speech and Theatre at Brooklyn College.

James A. Hawley has accepted appointment as Acting Technical Director of the Drake University Theatre.

August Staub, formerly Assistant Technical Director at Louisiana State University, has accepted a position at Eastern Michigan College.

There are several new members of the speech staff of Indiana University. On the Bloomington campus Ronald W. Wendahl is a new instructor; James Bost, Robert E. Johnson, Arthur Katt, John Swart, George T. Bedard, Irving Cohen, James Elrod, Earle Gister, Joseph G. Green, Alex Kemeny, and John A. Mills are teaching associates; Henrietta DuPree, Sandy Havens, Robert M. Lewis, Ann E. Menne, Allen Williams, Robert B. Wilson, Jack Ruff, Betty Shuford, Margaret Hakes, Louise Kent, Sarah C. McLain, Shirley McKay, Sharon Williams, and Nancy Kay Williams are graduate assistants.

Paul I. McClendon is a new instructor at the Indianapolis Extension Center. New teaching associates at the various Extension Centers are

Wilbur Lee Martin, Gary; James A. Purkhiser, Fort Wayne; William C. Teufel, Indianapolis; and Marvin E. DeBoer, East Chicago.

Two new instructors in the School of Speech at Kent [Ohio] State University are Thomas J. McManus and Donald E. Horace.

Eugene Vasilew has joined the staff of Lehigh University as Assistant Professor of Speech and Radio.

Irene Huenefeld and George H. Gunn are new Assistant Professors of Speech at Louisiana State University this year. The former is teaching courses in costume; the latter, voice science and audiology. C. Wesley Lambert has accepted appointment as Television Producer at the Louisiana State University Television and Film Center, and Arthur J. Jacobs is the new Program Director for WLSU, Louisiana State FM station. Andrew Rasbury is a new Assistant Technical Director at LSU.

A new member of the speech faculty of MacMurray College is Eugene K. Bristow.

Margaret McClellan, on leave from the University of Florida, is a Visiting Professor of Speech at Madison College this year.

Parker Zellers is a new addition to the speech and theatre staff at Monmouth College.

Fred Tewel is the new Dean of Men at Midwestern University.

At Mississippi Southern College Thomas B. Maclin is the new Director of Radio and Television; Robert Treser is serving as Technical Director of Theatre.

At Purdue University two new buildings for the Department of Speech are under construction. Loeb Auditorium is scheduled for completion by September, 1958. It will house both the Loeb Theatre, with a seating capacity of 1100, and the Experimental Theatre, which will accommodate an audience of 225. The

building w
the rehears
neously, tw
dressing roo
ette, and a
facilities for
of the stru

Heavilon
classrooms,
building w
ing those
discussion
skills. The
tors, fore
business a

The new
the Depart
developme
out, it w
classroom
which wi
ities.

There
the Pur
G. Stock
instructo
Hill, Jan
E. Walto
ton Trin
clinical
ty Rae
Sills. T

las S. E
James
Scheele
Smith,

Fred
St. Ol
Speech
replace
a posi

New
Jose
Dorot
Ado
Illino
Lewis

Ne
Univ
struc
Crow
and

building will also have sufficient space for the rehearsal of five different shows simultaneously, two star dressing rooms, two chorus dressing rooms, showers, locker rooms, a kitchenette, and a greenroom. A large scene shop with facilities for power equipment is an integral part of the structure.

Heavilon Hall will house departmental offices, classrooms, the clinic, and laboratories. The building will contain fifty-six classrooms, including those designed for instruction in group discussion and for the development of listening skills. There will be office space for administrators, forensic activities, adult education in business and industrial speech, and the faculty. The new building will also provide space for the Department of English and a laboratory for developmental reading. Air-conditioned throughout, it will have two office floors and three classroom floors in addition to the basement, which will house the speech correction facilities.

There have been many new additions to the Purdue speech faculty this year. Joseph G. Stockdale is a new assistant professor. New instructors are William I. Gorden, D. Arno Hill, James A. Johnson, Charles R. Petrie, Jr., E. Walter Richter, George A. Sanborn, J. Clifton Trimble, and Carl K. White. New graduate clinical assistants are Helen V. Anderson, Betty Rae Foster, Alyce Rae Keagle, and Shirley Sills. The new graduate assistants are Douglas S. Benbow, Karl W. Held, Lyle E. Lapray, James L. Roberts, Ellis J. Santone, Henry Z. Scheele, Herbert W. Simmons, D. Richard Smith, and Frances S. Smith.

Fred Phelps has joined the speech staff of St. Olaf College as Assistant Professor of Speech and Assistant Director of Forensics. He replaces Kenneth G. Wilkens, who has accepted a position at the University of Texas.

New Assistant Professors of Speech at San Jose State College are James M. Craig and Dorothy Hadley.

Additions to the speech staff of Southern Illinois University are James V. Fee, Alberta Lewis Humble, and Beverley Parsch.

New appointments at Southern Methodist University are those of A. Ray Johnson, Instructor in Speech and Theatre; and Porter Crow and Gloria Read, Lecturers in Speech and Theatre.

Morris Val Jones has accepted appointment to the staff of the Stanford University Speech and Hearing Clinic. He conducts a course in the speech and language problems in cerebral palsy. A new instructor at Stanford is Daryl Waldron, who teaches the basic course sequences in voice and diction and assists Dorothy Huntington in the program for foreign students. New Clinical Assistants for the current year are Barbara Woolf, Wallace Scott, Barbara Petersen, Mary Ann Kennelly, Fred Garbee, Max O'Connell, and Patricia London.

The Audiology Clinic of the Veterans Administration Hospital in San Francisco has set up two half-time internships for graduate students at Stanford. This year's appointees are Denny Dickenson and Ira Ventry. Joseph Chaiklin has received a full-time internship at the same hospital.

New appointments at The State College of Washington are E. James Lennon, Assistant Professor of Speech, and W. Lloyd Turner, Instructor in Speech.

The Department of Speech at Stephen F. Austin State College added two members to its faculty this fall, Sally M. Gearhardt, Director of Drama, and Edna Sorber, Assistant Coach of Debate.

Mary Louise Gehring, formerly Director of Debate at Mississippi Southern College, has accepted a position at Stetson University.

Lorna Seabury Lengfeld is a new member of the speech faculty at Stout State College.

Frank E. Funk has joined the staff of The School of Speech of Syracuse University.

Clayton Fields, formerly of the Extension Division of the University of Connecticut, has accepted appointment as Director of Technical Theatre at Texas Christian University. He replaces Walker James, who is now Co-Director of the Tulsa Little Theatre.

New additions to the speech staff of the University of California at Los Angeles are Alfred L. Larr, Assistant Professor of Speech, and Michael J. D'Asaro, Instructor in Speech.

The Department of Speech of the University of Connecticut inaugurated this year a graduate program in speech pathology and audiology leading to the M.A. degree. Graduate assist-

antships are available under this new program. For particulars, write

Professor David C. Phillips, Head
Department of Speech and Drama
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut.

The University of Connecticut opened its \$600,000 Little Theatre on 13 November with a presentation of *Death of a Salesman*. The building includes an auditorium seating five hundred, a workshop, a costume shop, a green room, make-up rooms, offices, and classrooms. The Department of Speech has also just finished designing the two wings it will occupy in the new Fine Arts Center, construction on which is soon to start. Facilities will include an experimental theatre, an arena theatre, a radio workshop area, a scene shop, and an experimental laboratory for speech pathology and audiology in addition to the usual offices, seminar rooms, and clinic and observation rooms.

New staff members include Robert F. Hejna, in charge of the speech pathology and audiology program; Frank Ballard, a technical director in theatre; and Donald Murray, a lighting technician.

Theodore Kundrat has joined the Department of Speech at the Chicago Undergraduate Division of the University of Illinois, instructing part-time in voice and diction.

New members of the faculty of the University of Maryland's Overseas Program are Glen M. Loney (University of Nevada), Clair R. Henderlinder (Western Reserve University), Arthur Stockton Hough, Jr. (University of Oregon), Harold Monroe Jordan (University of South Dakota), Herbert L. Swan (Menlo College), and Donald Hill.

New members of the speech department on the College Park campus are Alice Peet, Frank Dolan, Ted Taylor, Jr., Ruth Price, and James W. Hillis.

After a long period of committee study and discussion, the Department of Speech of the University of Michigan has entered the second phase of a program integrating elementary instruction in dramatics for the areas of theatre, radio, and television. Last year the courses in scene design and stagecraft were revised to include consideration of scene design and construction for television. This fall the Department is offering a beginning course in acting for stage, radio, and television. During the second

semester students may take a beginning course in directing drama for the three media. After they have completed these preliminary integrated courses, students may take specialized courses in dramatic production in any of the three media.

New faculty members at Michigan include James Brock, Visiting Professor of Speech (on leave from Michigan State University), Walter Stevens, Instructor in Speech; and several new appointments to the Speech Clinic: Gwen Adams, Psychiatric Social Worker; Hai-Yen Lin, Consultant in Pediatrics; and Louis Lerea, Research Assistant (on leave from Northern Illinois State College).

A new member of the staff of the Department of Speech of the University of New Mexico is Bernarr Cooper.

Richard Douthit has accepted a position at the University of North Carolina.

The Department of Speech and Hearing of the University of Oregon Medical School, Crippled Children's Division, reports several additions to its staff. Marcheta Allen joined it in November. Donald Nelson has replaced Robert Blakeley, on leave of absence to complete his doctorate, and Robert Casteel has replaced Deryl Wood, who has resigned.

New members of the Department of Speech of the University of Southern California are James McBath, assistant professor, and the following graduate teaching assistants: Joyce Baisden, Eugene Borghi, William Carver, Robert Cole, J. T. Daniel, Theodore Dixon, Richard L. Hughes, Donald Kinstler, Robert Klein, E. Franck Lee, Fred McMahon, Wayne Miller, Sally Rich, James Edward Parker, Harold E. Salisbury, Maurice Sklar, and Margaret Ford Taylor in speech, and Susan Rodgers and Paul Seibert in drama.

At the University of Wisconsin new staff members for the 1956-1957 academic year are Robert H. Hethmon, Jr., Assistant Professor of Speech; Jerry McNeely, Instructor in Speech; Sara F. Cattle, Instructor in Speech Education; Marion L. Davis, Vera Gurk, Hubert E. Kneprath, Bruce Markgraf, Shirley Shapiro Merzinsky, Graduate Fellows in Speech; Arnold E. Aronson and Marilyn Johnsrud, Research Assistants in Speech; and Lear L. Ashmore, Carlton R. Benz, Rosemary Bernard, Don P. Burdick, Pearl Campbell, Richard H. Carrington,

Joan C.
ian D. Fran
vey, Herbe
R. Jackson
son, Barba
liam L. R
cia A. Tow
Wallschlae
Works, G

Addition
University
er (on le
lege), Ric
Albert F
Pirol, g

Ann Sh
Michigan
and chil

New i
for the
enstein,
Charles

CONF
FESTIV

Nich
Annual
Alpha
April

The
Alpha
sponso
tain S
lege D
ninth
the fi
tion
Educa
ciety
the C
ones

Th
be th
on 7
Th
visio
cam

T
cam

ton, Joan C. Copley, Mary-Frances Cutnaw, Alan D. Frank, Agnes S. Harcar, Wesley D. Hervey, Herbert Hildebrandt, Eugene Jaberg, Ted R. Jackson, Howard S. Martin, Richard F. Mason, Barbara Maurer, James A. McGuire, William L. Ristow, William J. Robertson, Patricia A. Townsend, Henry Von Motke, Lois Ann Wallschlaeger, Charles A. White, and Berhard Works, Graduate Assistants in Speech.

Additions to the speech staff of Wayne State University are William H. Pipes, visiting lecturer (on leave as Dean of Philander Smith College), Richard L. Dean, assistant professor, and Albert Furbay, Robert Sandlin, and Orlando Pirolli, graduate fellows.

Ann Shaw has joined the faculty of Western Michigan College, teaching creative dramatics and children's theatre.

New instructors at West Virginia University for the current academic year are Walter Rockenstein, Virgil Gray, Eleanor E. George, and Charles M. Watson.

CONFERENCES, CONVENTIONS, FESTIVALS, AND INSTITUTES

Nicholas M. Cripe will direct the seventeenth Annual National Conference of Tau Kappa Alpha at Butler University on 15, 16, and 17 April of this year.

The School of Speech and the Tau Kappa Alpha Chapter of the University of Denver will sponsor the twenty-sixth annual Rocky Mountain Speech Conference in February. The College Division will be on the seventh, eighth, and ninth of February, the High School Division on the fifteenth and sixteenth. With the co-operation of the Denver Public Schools, The Adult Education Council of Denver, the Colorado Society for Speech and Hearing, and other agencies, the Conference has become one of the major ones in the country.

The campus of the University of Oregon will be the site of the Northwest Drama Conference on 7, 8, and 9 February.

The Tenth Annual Western Radio and Television Conference will be held on the Oregon campus on 14, 15, and 16 February.

The Alabama Speech Association met on the campus of Alabama College in December.

The Department of Speech and the Office of Short Courses and Conferences of the University of Washington sponsored a High School Speech Conference on 9 and 10 November.

Thirty teachers and 225 students attended a high school drama institute conducted by the Department of Speech of Wisconsin State College at Whitewater in October. The staff of the institute included Wynett Barnett, Chairman of the Department, Marie Toland of Wisconsin State College at La Crosse, Dori Hirsch, Milwaukee Downer College, and Mason Arnold, a professional scene designer. On 15 November the Department sponsored a high school Forensic Institute.

The Speech Association of Illinois held its annual convention in Urbana on 2 and 3 November, electing the following slate of officers at its business meeting on 2 November: President, Paul Hunsinger, Southern Illinois University; First Vice-President, Enid Ireland, Quincy Senior High School; Second Vice-President, Kenneth Burns, University of Illinois; Secretary-Treasurer, Marcella Oberle, Northwestern University; Editor of *Speech News*, Earl Davis, Thornton Fractional High School; and Business Manager of *Speech News*, Paul Crawford, Northern Illinois State College.

ON THE STAGE AND ON THE AIR

The theatre season at Adelphi College for the current academic year includes performances of *The Rivals*, *Of Mice and Men*, *Yellow Jacket*, a program of one-act plays, and Readers' Theatre productions of *The Scarecrow* and *Spoon River Anthology*.

In October the Old Vic Theatre troupe presented *Romeo and Juliet* and *Richard II* in the auditorium of Indiana University. In March the Metropolitan Opera company will make its annual visit to the Indiana campus, presenting *La Traviata* (with Renata Tebaldi, Giuseppe Campora, and Robert Merrill), and *La Perichole* (with Patrice Munsel, Theodor Uppmann, Paul Franke, and Ralph Herbert).

The playbill for the year at Indiana includes *The Patsy*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Blood Wedding*, *Cinderella*, *Hamlet*, *The Jordan River Revue*, and *Born Yesterday*.

Plays and their directors for the first semester at Los Angeles State College included *The Beautiful People* (Louis Gardemal), 31 October,

1, 2, and 3 November; *Arms and the Man* (Roger Altenberg), 28, 29, and 30 November and 1 December; and *The Imaginary Invalid* (Ted DeLay), 16, 17, 18, and 19 December.

The first two major dramatic productions at Louisiana State University this year were *The Confidential Clerk*, directed by Claude Shaver, and *Liliom*, directed by Sharon Anthony.

Madison College players presented *Outward Bound* as their first-semester production.

The Purdue Playshop theatre schedule for 1956-1957 includes *Stalag 17*, *The Desperate Hours*, *Ten Nights in a Barroom*, *The Rivals*, and eight sets of experimental one-act plays.

As part of the centennial celebration at San Jose State College, the Department of Speech and Drama will present two plays early in May: *Green Grow the Lilacs* (directed by James Clancy) for adults, and *Aladdin and his Wonderful Lamp* (directed by John Kerr) for children. Other plays produced and to be produced during the year include *Much Ado about Nothing*, *Shadow and Substance*, *Laburnum Grove*, *The Beaux' Stratagem*, and *Nobel Prize*.

At Southern Illinois University the current theatre season includes *Night Must Fall*, *Arms and the Man*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *A Streetcar Named Desire*, and *Our American Cousin*.

In a recent broadcast over station KPIX, San Francisco, Virgil Anderson, Hayes A. Newby, and Catherine Daly of the Stanford University Speech and Hearing Clinic discussed and demonstrated unusual techniques in therapy and reviewed the possibilities of careers in the field of speech correction and audiology. The program was one of a series, "Science Calling," directed by Tom Groody.

The plays selected for presentation at The Washington State College this year include *Of Thee I Sing*, *Twelve Angry Women*, *She Stoops to Conquer*, *Arms and the Man*, and *Plain and Fancy*.

The first-semester production at Stout State College was *Ring Around Elizabeth*.

Helen Menken, Executive Director of the American Shakespeare Festival Theatre and Academy was chairman of a committee which

solicited funds for a grant enabling 1,800 summer session students at Teachers College, Columbia University, to attend performances of *The Taming of the Shrew* at Stratford, Connecticut.

The grants included not only admission to the play, but also round-trip bus fare and dinner. The students attended in three groups of six hundred each, on 2, 4, and 5 August. As part of their visit they toured the theatre and academy and met the members of the cast.

Television majors at Texas Christian University are again presenting half-hour programs every Friday afternoon over Station KFJZ-TV. They first rehearse the individual programs of the series, "Telarama," on the two-camera closed-circuit system on the campus, then broadcast the program with students manning all the facilities of the commercial station.

The University of Maryland has announced its annual Victor Frenkil Television Script Award. It will award one prize of five hundred dollars to the author of the best original, unproduced dramatic television script, one hour in length. Universality of theme and originality of content will be the bases of judging. All entries must be submitted in standard two-column television script format, and entrants should refrain from using unusually complex production elements.

Manuscripts must be in the hands of the judges by 15 April, 1957. Entrants desiring return of their entries must enclose an addressed envelop and return postage. The winner will be notified by mail, and public announcement will be made in *Variety* and *Broadcasting-Television* on or about 25 April, 1957.

The Department of Speech of the University of Maryland reserves first production rights in the prize-winning script. All subsequent production rights revert to the author. Judges will accept only one entry per person. Submit manuscripts to

George F. Batka, Director
Radio-Television Division
Department of Speech
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland.

Theatrical productions at the University of Maryland this year include *Outward Bound*, *The Crucible*, *Twelfth Night*, and a musical to be selected.

Act II of *Under the Gaslight* was the 26 October "Studio Sampler" program over Station

WPAG-TV. To carry out the program's purpose of explaining the preparation of a theatrical production, a discussion of the scenic problems of the play by Edward Andreason, scene designer, and a talk on the costumes by Marjorie Smith, costumière, preceded the presentation of this sensational act.

Stage presentations at the University of Michigan included the whole of *Under the Gaslight*, *Hansel and Gretel*, *Juno and the Paycock*, and experimental productions of *The Devil and Daniel Webster* and the third act of *Billy Budd*.

Plays produced at the University Theatre of the University of Oregon this year include *Country Girl*, *Man and Superman*, *The Doctor in Spite of Himself*, *Desire Under the Elms*, and a major operatic production.

Theatre fare at the University of Wisconsin this year includes *Of Thee I Sing*, *Hedda Gabler*, *The Plough and the Stars*, *Morning's at Seven*, *Elizabeth the Queen*, and four groups of experimental productions of one-act plays directed by students.

Plays presented by the Vanderbilt University Theatre this season are *Oedipus Rex*, *The Drunkard*, *Measure for Measure*, and *Iolanthe*.

Wayne State University is currently transmitting fourteen half-hour television programs per week over its campus station, WTVS, and in addition presents four programs per week over commercial station WJBK-TV in Detroit. Outstanding programs this year are "For Doctors Only" and "For Doctors and You," emanating from the College of Medicine and the Wayne County Medical Society. A half-hour break between these two Friday evening programs enables viewers to phone in their questions about health and medicine for answering on the air. Other programs are "Social Case Histories," "Nursery Schools" (another double program), "So You're Having a Baby?" and "Living in Our Cities." Working under faculty supervision, students operate Radio Station WDET and also serve as crew for Wayne television programs. They direct the two Saturday night programs, a variety show and a news program taking the viewer behind the scenes of the city activities.

Stage presentations at Wayne this season are *The Great God Brown*, *The Italian Straw Hat*, *The Father*, *The Thieves' Carnival*, *The Beautiful People*, *The Tempest*, and *The Man who Married a Dumb Wife*.

The Mustard and Cheese Dramatics Club of Lehigh University presented *Richard II* during the first semester.

This season's playbill at Western Michigan College consists of *All the King's Men*, *Our Town*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *The Teahouse of the August Moon*, and *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs*.

Plays produced and to be produced at West Virginia University this year are *The Moon is Blue*, *The Seven Year Itch*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Death of a Salesman*, and *Sabrina Fair*.

The dramatic program at Wisconsin State College at Whitewater this year has consisted of more than the production of plays. (The playbill includes *The Rainmaker*, *Carousel*, and *Anna Christie*.) On 26 November the campus was the scene of a sectional play tournament. On 2, 3, and 4 December Theta Alpha Phi sponsored an exhibition of stage designs by Robert Edmond Jones and on 7 and 8 December its All-College One-Act Play Contest. Christmas tableaux with choral accompaniments were presented on 16 December. On 7 and 8 April Theta Alpha Phi will sponsor an exhibit of theatre memorabilia.

FORENSICS

The forensics squad of Los Angeles State College participated in the following activities during the fall semester: a television debate with the University of California at Los Angeles over Station KCOP on 21 October; the individual events tournament at Santa Barbara on 26 and 27 October; the practice debate tournament at Los Angeles City College on 2 and 3 November; a television debate with George Pepperdine College (again over Station KCOP) on 4 November; a television debate with the University of Southern California on 11 November; the novice debate tournament at East Los Angeles City College on 17 November; the Western States Tournament at Stockton College and the College of the Pacific on 29 November and 1 December; and the debate tournament at Occidental College on 7 and 8 December.

The second annual St. Olaf High School Speech Tournament will be held at St. Olaf College on 1 and 2 February. Events include debate, oratory, extemporaneous speaking, and radio speaking.

Pi Kappa Delta will hold its biennial convention on 14 and 15 April on the campus of South Dakota State College, Brookings. This will be the first time since 1941 that the association has convened in the Middle West, and its sponsors expect it to be one of the largest conventions of recent years.

Lenore Evans and Wayne Thompson of the Chicago Undergraduate Division of the University of Illinois are completing the conducting of the Fifth Annual National Contest in Public Discussion. The topic is the national question on American policy in the Middle East. Any university, college, or junior college may participate in the contest, the deadline for entering which was 1 December. Participants record twenty-five minute discussions and submit the tape to the judges. Winners of the 1956 contest were the University of Virginia, first place; Wisconsin State College at Eau Claire, second; and Idaho State College, third.

The Chicago Undergraduate Division received a chapter of Pi Kappa Delta last May. Lloyd Dudley, Governor of the Province of Illinois, officiated at the installation, assisted by Clarence Nystrom. Twenty-four students and alumni were initiated, along with Dean Charles Caveny, who became the first honorary member of the chapter, Illinois Psi.

The program of state contests for Wisconsin high schools belonging to the Wisconsin High School Forensic Association will resume on 1 March when the campus of the University of Wisconsin will be the site of the two-day state debate finals. Teams qualifying for the event will have survived district and sectional eliminations. Defending champions are from Kenosha High School and Milwaukee-Marquette University High School.

On 13 April nearly a thousand high school speakers who have rated "A" in two previous eliminations will gather on the Wisconsin campus for the state finals in oratory, extemporaneous speaking and reading, interpretative reading, declamation, and four-minute speaking.

This event will be the climax of the events sponsored by the Forensic Association, which begin in the fall with a tape-recorded panel discussion contest and a state-wide one-act play tournament.

Previous to the contest activity, the Wisconsin State Colleges co-operate with the Association in sponsoring high school speech institutes organized as workshops to assist students who will participate in contests during the year. During

the past fall the state colleges at Whitewater, Stevens Point, Eau Claire, La Crosse, Superior and Oshkosh sponsored such institutes. The chairman of the department of speech in these colleges will send the programs of their institutes to anyone who requests them.

The women's debate team of Wisconsin State College at Eau Claire was the first to become finalists in the ten years of the West Point National Invitational Debate Tournament. It was also the fourth year that Eau Claire teams had advanced to the finals. The women's Interstate Oratorical Champion in 1956 was Jocelyn Gilbertson, then a sophomore at WSC. The 1956 volume of *Winning Orations* is dedicated to the late Ralph Zimmermann, also of Eau Claire, who was the men's winner in 1955. Eau Claire won second place in the national finals in public discussion this past year, having won the national title in 1953.

Two hundred high school speakers from Minnesota and Wisconsin attended the Tenth Annual Discussion Clinic sponsored by the forensic department. Representatives of the State Department of Agriculture and the state president of the Farmers' Union addressed the group in convocation before the rounds of discussion which college moderators led.

PROMOTIONS

At Indiana University: Richard Moody to professor; Richard L. Scammon to associate professor.

At Purdue University: T. D. Hanley and Ross D. Smith to professor; H. L. Ewbank, Jr., Earl R. Harlan, and Frances Patton to associate professor; Keith S. Montgomery to assistant professor; William R. Ditton and Joseph G. Godwin to instructor.

At San Jose State College: Ward Rasmus to professor; Courtney Brooks to associate professor.

At Southern Methodist University: J. B. McGrath to assistant professor.

At the University of Maryland: Richard Hendricks to associate professor.

At the University of Wisconsin: Herman H. Brockhaus to professor.

At West Virginia University: Betty Ruth Phillips to assistant professor.

PERSONALS

The Pennsylvania Speech Association unanimously re-elected Thoburn V. Baker as Executive-Secretary at its October convention. Dur-

ing his tenure of office last year membership doubled.

Don F. Blakely was one of the co-directors of the Michiana Summer Theatre.

Harlan Bloomer and George Herman presented two round-table sections on speech and hearing problems at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Pediatrics at the Hotel Statler, New York, on 9 and 10 October. Hsi-Yen Liu served as recorder for the sessions.

James H. Butler was on sabbatical leave during the fall semester. He toured Europe, photographing historically important theatres.

R. D. Clark has accepted appointment as Dean of the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Oregon.

J. Edwin Culbertson received a second grant from the Foundation for Economic Research last summer. He evaluated speech in the Allis Chalmers Manufacturing Company of Milwaukee.

Edith Dabney has retired from her position at Louisiana State University and is now living in Jefferson City, Missouri.

John T. Dugan has received renewal of both his Fulbright and Penfield Fellowships to continue for a second year his studies of the development of the modern Italian theatre and cinema. Maintaining a residence in Rome, he has visited theatres in Yugoslavia, Austria, Germany, Switzerland, and France, as well as traveling extensively throughout Italy.

Joe E. Ford is a member of the Advisory Council of the South Eastern Theatre Conference, representing West Virginia. He taught dramatics classes at the Third Annual West Virginia Recreation Festival at Jackson's Mill on 19, 20, and 21 October.

Jacob Foster was on sabbatical leave during the first semester. He did research in the history of the theatre in Europe.

Gary W. Gaiser will be on sabbatical leave during the second semester. He will study at the University of Bristol.

Giles W. Gray was on sabbatical leave during the first semester.

William and Claribel Halstead, who conducted a summer theatre tour of Europe, have taken up residence in London for the year. They will study contemporary British theatre while there.

The Indiana Speech and Hearing Therapy Association has elected T. D. Hanley as its president. He has also been appointed to a three-year term on the Graduate Council of Purdue University.

Donald E. Hargis is the new editor of *Western*

Speech. Waldo Phelps is Associate Editor, and Gale Richards is Book Review Editor.

F. J. Hunter spent the 1956 summer session as a visiting lecturer and director at the University of California.

Dominic LaRusso has accepted appointment as Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Washington.

Harold M. Livingston was a visiting professor at the University of Oregon last summer, teaching courses in radio and television.

Theta Alpha Phi has elected Sam M. Marks vice-president for a two-year term.

Lowell Matson spent a part of the summer on the drama staff of the National Music Camp at Interlochen, Michigan. He is currently an editorial advisor to the *Educational Theatre Journal* and chairman of the AETA audio-visual aids project.

Yetta G. Mitchell is serving as Acting Chairman of the Department of Speech of the School of Education of New York University.

Keith S. Montgomery served as Director of Forensics for the University of Wyoming's three-week high school speech institute last summer. He is also the new editor of *The Speaker*.

D. E. Morley is spending the current academic year in Oslo as a Fulbright lecturer.

Oliver Nelson began a six-month sabbatical leave on 1 January. He is studying the co-operative movement in Denmark.

Lee Norvelle attended theatre performances in Rome, Athens, and Tokyo during the late summer. In Bangkok he lectured to the Cultural Society of Thailand.

The United States Air Force has awarded Robert Peters a twenty-two-thousand-dollar research grant. Mississippi Southern College has installed an acoustical laboratory on the Hattiesburg campus for him.

Carl A. Pitt is preparing a microcard edition of *Select British Eloquence*, for which Richard Murphy has written an introduction. The cost of this reduced edition will be approximately three dollars and a half.

Horace G. Rahskopf is on sabbatical leave during the current quarter. He is engaged in research at the Library of Congress.

Horace W. Robinson, on leave from the University of Oregon, is a visiting professor at the University of California at Los Angeles this year. LeRoy Hinze is replacing him at Oregon.

James Robinson is currently studying at the University of Chicago on a grant from the Fund for Adult Education of the Ford Foundation.

Florence Roll spent her first-semester leave studying children's theatre.

Ross D. Smith served as director of the Michiana Summer Theatre for the fifth successive year. He is the current chairman of the AETA summer theatre project.

Before the election, James J. Stansell, R. S. Cathcart, and Anthony Hillbruner "stumped" southern California in support of Proposition No. 3, the purpose of which was to provide bonds for a state college building program. Stansell is serving as Acting Dean of Graduate Studies at Los Angeles State College during the current academic year.

Glenn Starlin spent ten weeks of the past summer on a special assignment with the Educational Television and Radio Center.

M. D. Steer has accepted appointment as a consultant to the Muscatatuck State School for the Mentally Retarded at Butlersville, Indiana.

Earl Wells served as program chairman for the speech division meeting of the National

Education Association convention in Portland, Oregon, last summer.

Robert West has accepted appointment as Clinical Professor in the Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation of New York Medical College.

Carl K. White served as technical director of the Banff School of Fine Arts last summer.

Jean Starr Wiksell is directing the Banff Rouge Children's Theatre for the ninth year. For the nineteenth year she is serving as the consultant on puppetry for the Junior League of America.

Kenneth Scott Wood has returned after a year's sabbatical leave in Norway, where he was a Fulbright lecturer. In addition to addresses at the Children's Clinic in the State Hospital in Oslo, the University of Bergen, the University of Uppsala, and the University of Stockholm, he participated in training courses for speech therapists and lectured to physical therapy medical students, dentists, teachers, and lay groups.